

Consent-Based Siting

From: Stephanie Thomas [<mailto:stthomas@citizen.org>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:40 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Stephanie Thomas

77003

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mark Aflatooni [mailto:markaflatooni@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:30 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mark Aflatooni

78755

Consent-Based Siting

From: Olivia Aguirre [<mailto:Bibi512oa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:21 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Olivia Aguirre

78610

Consent-Based Siting

From: Harold Albers [mailto:harold_albers@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:25 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Harold Albers

76820

Consent-Based Siting

From: karen alden [<mailto:tessnegracie@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:20 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

karen alden

78155

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kathleen Alexander [mailto:dogone1205@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:49 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kathleen Alexander

77007

Consent-Based Siting

From: Genevieve Ali [mailto:Gen_ali@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Genevieve Ali

78733

Consent-Based Siting

From: Frances Allen [<mailto:flaallen48@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Frances Allen

76133

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kimberly Allen [<mailto:Kalleninteriors@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:31 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kimberly Allen

75243

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sam Allred [<mailto:samallred1937@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:05 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sam Allred

78411

Consent-Based Siting

From: Denis Andrews [<mailto:itsdeniswln@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Denis Andrews

75051

Consent-Based Siting

From: Amanda [<mailto:Amandachasecollins@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Amanda

75204

Consent-Based Siting

From: Bek [<mailto:beksabbath@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:19 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bek

78702

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marilyn [<mailto:nasa1mom@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marilyn

78501

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tony [<mailto:Tonytone3311@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 10:58 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tony

79714

Consent-Based Siting

From: Laura Arbilla [mailto:lacuidadanadelmundo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:07 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Laura Arbilla

78727

Consent-Based Siting

From: Fred Armendariz [<mailto:farmendariz4@miners.utep.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:59 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Fred Armendariz

79912

Consent-Based Siting

From: Deborah Armintor [<mailto:deborah.armintor@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Deborah Armintor

76209

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lisa Arriaga [<mailto:lesalou4@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lisa Arriaga

77019

Consent-Based Siting

From: Glory Arroyos [<mailto:garroyos@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:25 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Glory Arroyos

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Margie artieschoufsky [mailto:margieartie@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Margie artieschoufsky

78665

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rizwana Ashraf [<mailto:rizwana.ashraf01@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rizwana Ashraf

77469

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jan Atkinson [<mailto:janleeatk@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:38 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jan Atkinson

78130

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sharon Atwell [mailto:dweeze206@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based
siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sharon Atwell

77551

Consent-Based Siting

From: micki bailes [<mailto:bmildred7@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:56 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

micki bailes

79912

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jamie Baird [<mailto:jamie.baird@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:52 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jamie Baird

78676

Consent-Based Siting

From: Danna Baker [<mailto:dkbaker@entouch.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:35 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Danna Baker

77469

Consent-Based Siting

From: Freda Ballas [mailto:onedoodle@sbcglobal.net] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Freda Ballas

75225

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jack Balsley [<mailto:jackbalsley@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:32 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jack Balsley

78063

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dave Bardnell [<mailto:bardnelldave@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:28 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dave Bardnell

79912

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lola Barello [<mailto:iblobar@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:38 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lola Barelo

75019

Consent-Based Siting

From: Wendy Barker [<mailto:wendy.barker@utsa.edu>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:17 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Wendy Barker

78231

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gloria Barnett [<mailto:gloria619@consolidated.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:30 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gloria Barnett

75904

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cordelia Barrera [<mailto:cordeliapilot@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:15 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cordelia Barrera

79410

Consent-Based Siting

From: Martha Barrett [mailto:mebarrett6608@att.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Martha Barrett

75230

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jane Basey [<mailto:j.basey@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:33 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jane Basey

78753

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joyce L. Beck [<mailto:jlsbeck@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joyce L. Beck

76123

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tamar Ben-Ur [<mailto:tamarbenur@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:06 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tamar Ben-Ur

78734

Consent-Based Siting

From: Linda Berger [<mailto:linda@dnstexas.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Linda Berger

76137

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joan Berger [<mailto:Joanberger@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:54 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joan Berger

75248

Consent-Based Siting

From: Andrew Berkson [<mailto:aberkson@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:46 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Andrew Berkson

75757

Consent-Based Siting

From: michael Bernstein [<mailto:mbernstein@elp.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

michael Bernstein

79902

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elizabeth Berry [<mailto:edesca16@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:18 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elizabeth Berry

77381

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Beverly [<mailto:sgtwayne@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:05 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Beverly

77631

Consent-Based Siting

From: Barbara Bieber-Hamby [mailto:bbieberhamby@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:37 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Barbara Bieber-Hamby

75964

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Bierd [<mailto:jimbierd@swbell.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:15 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Bierd

76248

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sandra Bieri [mailto:Sandrabieri@abcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sandra Bieri

78701

Consent-Based Siting

From: Walter Birdwell [<mailto:wbbirdwell@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Walter Birdwell

78578

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gene Bitner [<mailto:webmaster@almostangels.org>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gene Bitner

79107

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ross BLACK [<mailto:ross.black@ymail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ross BLACK

76078

Consent-Based Siting

From: Diane Black [<mailto:dianeblack54@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Diane Black

77077

Consent-Based Siting

From: Pamela Blades [<mailto:pblades@embarqmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:45 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pamela Blades

77486

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joseph Blakeley [<mailto:Josepheblakeley@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joseph Blakeley

77642

Consent-Based Siting

From: mark blandford [<mailto:oblomov237@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

mark blandford

79124

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Blau [<mailto:bblau@aya.yale.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Blau

78757

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tommy Blum [<mailto:Tdblum11@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:41 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tommy Blum

78247

Consent-Based Siting

From: Victoria Blum [<mailto:Vblum0611@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:41 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Victoria Blum

78247

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Bohmfalk [<mailto:robertbohmfalk@att.net>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 12:30 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Bohmfalk

78155

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Bonazzi [<mailto:latitudesinternational@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:53 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Bonazzi

78201

Consent-Based Siting

From: Yvette Bonilla [<mailto:ybonillaleach@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:00 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Yvette Bonilla

78223

Consent-Based Siting

From: Leana Bosley [<mailto:ljbusiness@msn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Leana Bosley

75098

Consent-Based Siting

From: Larise Boughner [<mailto:Lariseboughner@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:24 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Larise Boughner

78613

Consent-Based Siting

From: james bourque [<mailto:jameslbouque@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:48 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

james bourque

78613

Consent-Based Siting

From: Andrew Boyd [<mailto:starlessplanetpanic@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:04 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Andrew Boyd

77084

Consent-Based Siting

From: Malaika Boyd [<mailto:kobaltkween@gmail.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:58 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Malaika Boyd

78660

Consent-Based Siting

From: D J Boykin [mailto:dru_rt92@twc.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:38 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

D J Boykin

76021

Consent-Based Siting

From: R T Boykin Jr [mailto:dru_rt92@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

R T Boykin Jr

76021

Consent-Based Siting

From: Claud Bramblett [<mailto:chramblett@utexas.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Claud Bramblett

78751

Consent-Based Siting

From: Keri Branch [<mailto:kdbbranch72@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:47 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Keri Branch

78644

Consent-Based Siting

From: Charles Branning [<mailto:cbranning@grandecom.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

Dear DOE

I personally agree with this prepared text:

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Charles Branning

78414

Consent-Based Siting

From: Angelika Braxton [mailto:angelikasbraxton@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:51 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Angelika Braxton

78109

Consent-Based Siting

From: Theodore Brazeau [<mailto:t2brz@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Theodore Brazeau

78620

Consent-Based Siting

From: Misty Breaux [<mailto:sistabcajon@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Misty Breaux

78749

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paula & Don Brennecke [<mailto:paulabren@cableone.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:40 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paula & Don Brennecke

75418

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jan Brin [<mailto:jennyokeeffenm@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jan Brin

75225

Consent-Based Siting

From: Karl Brooks [<mailto:kemson@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Karl Brooks

77590

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dorothy Lynn Brooks [<mailto:amberitha@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dorothy Lynn Brooks

76013

Consent-Based Siting

From: Edna Brooks [mailto:sapphire_4575@yahoo.com] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Edna Brooks

14810

Consent-Based Siting

From: Fred Brown [<mailto:effinbrown@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:48 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Fred Brown

78521

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jim Brown [<mailto:lowrd@msn.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 10:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jim Brown

79714

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Brown [<mailto:jameshoustonbrown777@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:08 PM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Brown

75025

Consent-Based Siting

From: Leigh Brown [<mailto:Ladygrey552004@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:32 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Leigh Brown

78739

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary Brown [<mailto:Mleebrown1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:27 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Brown

78578

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rosa Brown [<mailto:torillaface@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rosa Brown

79905

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ted Brown [<mailto:ritratto98@shcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ted Brown

77009

Consent-Based Siting

From: LYN BUERGER [<mailto:lynarts@flash.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:29 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

LYN BUERGER

76012

Consent-Based Siting

From: Suzanne Bullock [mailto:bullocks4art@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:56 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Suzanne Bullock

78620

Consent-Based Siting

From: Adam Burdick [mailto:aburdock21@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:38 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Adam Burdick

75052

Consent-Based Siting

From: Alyssa Burgin [<mailto:aburgin4peace@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Alyssa Burgin

78232

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kathleen Burnette [mailto:kathleen_burnette@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kathleen Burnette

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Bruce Burns [<mailto:burnsb319@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:53 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bruce Burns

78753

Consent-Based Siting

From: Teresa Burns-Hansen [<mailto:Burnshansen@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:20 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Teresa Burns-Hansen

76571

Consent-Based Siting

From: Julie Bush [<mailto:Julie92@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Julie Bush

78414

Consent-Based Siting

From: Raul Bustillo [<mailto:00712@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:29 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Raul Bustillo

77414

Consent-Based Siting

From: Raquel Buxton [<mailto:iowayne@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:48 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Raquel Buxton

77092

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Cain [<mailto:potterlanestudios@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:21 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Cain

77845

Consent-Based Siting

From: Edye Calderon [<mailto:edyec@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Edye Calderon

79707

Consent-Based Siting

From: Greg Caldwell [<mailto:Gwellq3@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Greg Caldwell

78652

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marianne Calvanese [<mailto:drmacal@shcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 10:25 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marianne Calvanese

78640

Consent-Based Siting

From: walter calvey [<mailto:jcalv59@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:05 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

walter calvey

76117

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jean Cameron [<mailto:j-cameron@suddenlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:57 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jean Cameron

77845

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dennis Campa [<mailto:adventuresinsound@koop.org>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:22 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dennis Campa

78723

Consent-Based Siting

From: dorothea cangelosi [<mailto:ozwellnessranch@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:44 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

dorothea cangelosi

77484

Consent-Based Siting

From: terry canipe [mailto:treetopflyer08@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:10 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

terry canipe

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sandra Cantrell [<mailto:scantrell@wildblue.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:50 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone. I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT THE TX RAILROAD COMMISSION HAD ALREADY PERMITTED THIS WASTE STORAGE, WITH NO APPROVAL OF ANY VOTERS. I HOPE YOU WILL DO SOMETHING TO ALLOW PEOPLE TO REGISTER THEIR OPINIONS OF SUCH A DANGEROUS PROPOSITION.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sandra Cantrell

76448

Consent-Based Siting

From: Roel Cantú [<mailto:roelcan2@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:16 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Roel Cantú

78572

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ida Carey [mailto:careyida@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:35 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ida Carey

75115

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Carpenter [<mailto:johnmaccarpenter@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:34 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Carpenter

79735

Consent-Based Siting

From: KEVIN CHACKO [<mailto:KEVINCHACKO22@YAHOO.COM>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

KEVIN CHACKO

75056

Consent-Based Siting

From: Connie Chamberlin [<mailto:cookie@blossomtel.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Connie Chamberlin

75416

Consent-Based Siting

From: Russ Champiny [<mailto:russal43@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:19 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Russ Champiny

75070

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lucinda Channon [<mailto:lchannon@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lucinda Channon

76123

Consent-Based Siting

From: Stephanie Chapman [mailto:Latina_chick316@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:15 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Stephanie Chapman

78666

Consent-Based Siting

From: Russell Cherry [<mailto:medicrbc1@comcast.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Russell Cherry

76502

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Childress [mailto:1938johnc@live.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:41 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Childress

75228

Consent-Based Siting

From: jose choquehuanca [<mailto:jose.choquehuanca@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:55 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

jose choquehuanca

77494

Consent-Based Siting

From: Russell Churchwell
[mailto:churchwellrm@gmail.com] Sent: Sunday, July 31,
2016 12:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Russell Churchwell

78666

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Jolly Clark [<mailto:jollyclark1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Jolly Clark

78748

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Clary [<mailto:opusethepoet@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Clary

75040

Consent-Based Siting

From: Bernard Clegg [<mailto:balclegg@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bernard Clegg

78705

Consent-Based Siting

From: Martha Cludius [<mailto:marthacludius@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:59 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Martha Cludius

76135

Consent-Based Siting

From: peggy cole [<mailto:peggycole2@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:55 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

peggy cole

78041

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Collins [<mailto:jamesgcollins@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Collins

76013

Consent-Based Siting

From: Claude Cook [<mailto:claudecook5@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:25 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Claude Cook

77597

Consent-Based Siting

From: James C. Cooke [<mailto:cookej@acu.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:31 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James C. Cooke

79699

Consent-Based Siting

From: john cooper [<mailto:dearjecj@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

john cooper

77327

Consent-Based Siting

From: Susan T Cooper [mailto:susan_jack@juno.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Susan T Cooper

75081

Consent-Based Siting

From: martin cordero [<mailto:dosequis9@yahoo.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

martin cordero

78210

Consent-Based Siting

From: Helen Coronado [<mailto:helen.coronado@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:24 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Helen Coronado

78112

Consent-Based Siting

From: Juan Cortes [<mailto:Juancortes83@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Juan Cortes

76131

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patricia Cotton [<mailto:pac789lux@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:58 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patricia Cotton

75454

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ed Covington [mailto:chibo_viejo@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 11:17 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ed Covington

77584

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jace Covington [mailto:cheezychimp1238@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:37 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jace Covington

75040

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gary Cox [<mailto:knightfxsolutions@swbell.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:34 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gary Cox

76180

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jeralynn Cox [<mailto:jackeeco@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jeralynn Cox

76132

Consent-Based Siting

From: Leah Cox [<mailto:talulabeth@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Leah Cox

77058

Consent-Based Siting

From: Phillip J Crabill [<mailto:crab430@me.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:06 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Phillip J Crabill

75068

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jamey Craig [<mailto:Jameycraig1074@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jamey Craig

74525

Consent-Based Siting

From: Katherine Craig [<mailto:katherinecraig19@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Katherine Craig

75093

Consent-Based Siting

From: AnaLisa Crandall [mailto:analisa_duran@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:44 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

AnaLisa Crandall

78101

Consent-Based Siting

From: Constance Crawford [mailto:conniecrawford@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:46 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Constance Crawford

79902

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gloria Crenshaw [<mailto:Ornurse9@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:57 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gloria Crenshaw

77386

Consent-Based Siting

From: Christine Crosby [<mailto:christinecrosby@me.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:17 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Christine Crosby

78702

Consent-Based Siting

From: Madeleine Crozat-Williams [<mailto:magicas@pdq.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:57 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I do not want nuclear waste shipped through Texas to a storage or disposal site and I do not want nuclear waste stored in Texas. Nuclear waste containers on a transport vehicle could be attacked by terrorists and that could cause a deadly catastrophe if anywhere near a large population center.

And I do not want the Ogalla aquifer threatened by possible contamination by nuclear waste, which is highly probably considering the number of earthquakes which recent fracking has caused and the close proximity of fracking sites to the aquifer. This is a poorly thought out plan which has been adopted simply because the government sees West Texas as a very underpopulated wasteland area of no importance with few residents to oppose the plan. Quite to the contrary, the area where this waste would support houses a very fragile ecosystem and overlies a hugely important source of water for the region.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t

even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

Texas is not your dumping ground for nuclear waste. I adamantly oppose the plan to make it one!! I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Madeleine Crozat-Williams

77004

Consent-Based Siting

From: Madolyn Crumpton [mailto:crumptonlaw@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:44 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Madolyn Crumpton

78723

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jesse Cunningham [<mailto:jessecunningham1992@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:34 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jesse Cunningham

77532

Consent-Based Siting

From: L.K. Curry [<mailto:lkcurry@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:02 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

L.K. Curry

75409

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kristin Dain [<mailto:kjdain@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:47 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kristin Dain

75238

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sherry Dana [mailto:sdana@pdana.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sherry Dana

78626

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paul Davenport [<mailto:psdavenport@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paul Davenport

75766

Consent-Based Siting

From: Frank Daversa [<mailto:newworlds25@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone. Do it because it is the right thing to do.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Frank Daversa

77084

Consent-Based Siting

From: John David [<mailto:jddavid88@icloud.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:07 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John David

77084

Consent-Based Siting

From: Chuck Davies [<mailto:chuckdavies1976@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:44 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Chuck Davies

75028

Consent-Based Siting

From: alfredo davila [<mailto:alfreddavila@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:24 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

alfredo davila

78222

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jackie De Hon [<mailto:jackiedehon@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

If people continue to CREATE TOXIC WASTE, it should be STORED WHERE IT IS CREATED...NOT SHIPPED TO TEXAS WHERE INNOCENTS MIGHT BE HARMED BY IT. In addition, toxic waste has the potential of harming people's health in all of the places it travels through on its way to other people's homes and work places. DON'T DO IT--for all our sakes!.

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won't know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation's high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn't one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jackie De Hon

78133

Consent-Based Siting

From: winston deblanc [<mailto:deblanc1934@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

winston deblanc

77833

Consent-Based Siting

From: Shirley Dehmer [<mailto:shirleydehmer@nctv.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Shirley Dehmer

78654

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marvin DeJear [mailto:mdejear@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:29 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marvin DeJear

78221

Consent-Based Siting

From: Anne del Prado [mailto:freespirt_41@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:09 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Anne del Prado

77541

Consent-Based Siting

From: Thomas Demore [<mailto:tademore@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:32 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Thomas Demore

78414

Consent-Based Siting

From: Merritt Denman [<mailto:Merrittdenman@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Merritt Denman

76710

Consent-Based Siting

From: carol Denning [<mailto:seasoned5@yahoo.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:20 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

carol Denning

76010

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rachele Denton-Taylor [<mailto:Rad187@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:14 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rachelle Denton-Taylor

77429

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joshua Deveraux [<mailto:spadesplayer2222@Yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joshua Deveraux

76542

Consent-Based Siting

From: ROBERT DIBELER [<mailto:wb3gubx3@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:54 PM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

ROBERT DIBELER

77351

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sue DiCara [mailto:sdbookgal@mac.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:08 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I strongly oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be far too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been wrongly portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I surely hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and wisely reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sue DiCara

79924

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patricia Dicoste [<mailto:Langpro@swbell.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:18 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patricia Dicoste

77401

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Didear [<mailto:daviddidear@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:27 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Didear

75180

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sophia Donnelly [<mailto:sophiak72@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 4:48 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sophia Donnelly

78721

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lawrence Donohoe [<mailto:ladtx5@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lawrence Donohoe

76453

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tom Dornbusch [<mailto:rtdetour@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:18 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tom Dornbusch

77007

Consent-Based Siting

From: Katya Dow [<mailto:katyadow07@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:19 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Katya Dow

77005

Consent-Based Siting

From: Christopher Dowling [<mailto:cod188@outlook.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Christopher Dowling

78734

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Draughon [<mailto:dgdragon1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Draughon

76210

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patt Dreyer [<mailto:Pattdreyer@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patt Dreyer

76021

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tim Duda [<mailto:timduda@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:08 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tim Duda

78209

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sydney Dunlap [mailto:sydneydunlap@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sydney Dunlap

77389

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ronnie Dugger [mailto:ronniedugger@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:51 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ronnie Dugger

78705

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sylvia Duncan [<mailto:sduncan1949@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:08 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sylvia Duncan

75075

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sydney Dunlap [mailto:sydneydunlap@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sydney Dunlap

77389

Consent-Based Siting

From: Steve Dupuis [<mailto:sjdupuis@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:18 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Steve Dupuis

75238

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nancy Durr [<mailto:ndurr43@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 3:10 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nancy Durr

78336

Consent-Based Siting

From: Barbara Eckert [<mailto:beckert@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 9:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Barbara Eckert

76309

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sabrina Eckles [<mailto:biner@swbell.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sabrina Eckles

79416

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patrick Edwards [<mailto:Yahdi5000@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patrick Edwards

79605

Consent-Based Siting

From: Susan Ellis [<mailto:sellis8855@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Susan Ellis

75006

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jon Emery [<mailto:emerysongs@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:45 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jon Emery

78757

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dee Emrich [<mailto:demrich@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dee Emrich

76017

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nathan Endo [<mailto:Nate.endo91@gmail.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nathan Endo

76308

Consent-Based Siting

From: Courtney England [<mailto:Cocoa77055@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Courtney England

77043

Consent-Based Siting

From: Pamela Evans [<mailto:gardenqueen@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pamela Evans

75143

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carleen Evans [mailto:evans_carleen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:13 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carleen Evans

78802

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Evans [<mailto:jimevans4763@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Evans

78737

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kinney Evitt [mailto:killemall76@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based
siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kinney Evitt

79761

Consent-Based Siting

From: Adam F [<mailto:Adam.floyd@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Adam F

77584

Consent-Based Siting

From: Albert Fahndrick [<mailto:the.fahnz@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:15 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Albert Fahndrick

77338

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nanci Falley [<mailto:Aihrnanci@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:33 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nanci Falley

78644

Consent-Based Siting

From: Grace Farago [mailto:gracefarago@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Grace Farago

77061

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mark Farley [mailto:mefarley@airmail.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:23 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mark Farley

75040

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kathleen Faulkingham [<mailto:Brinseana@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:26 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kathleen Faulkingham

76367

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lauren Fenenbock [<mailto:shainablue@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lauren Fenenbock

79902

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jordan Fengel [<mailto:jordan.fengel@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:11 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jordan Fengel

76504

Consent-Based Siting

From: Micaela Fierro [<mailto:meandianflowe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:59 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Micaela Fierro

79925

Consent-Based Siting

From: Edgar Finck [<mailto:emfiii@msn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:30 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Edgar Finck

78626

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lewis Finley [<mailto:Wayne.Finley@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:03 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lewis Finley

75219

Consent-Based Siting

From: SUSAN FINLEY [<mailto:sellis2@austin.rr.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

SUSAN FINLEY

78613

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carol Fly [<mailto:carfly@workmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:12 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carol Fly

78727

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patricia Foley [<mailto:Edfoleys@windstream.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:30 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patricia Foley

77479

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kim Folse [<mailto:caravacacruz@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kim Folse

77651

Consent-Based Siting

From: cd foote [<mailto:tuckfoot@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:25 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I TOTALLY oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

cd foote

78701

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lynn Forsythe [<mailto:lynn.forsythe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:08 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lynn Forsythe

75052

Consent-Based Siting

From: Delaina Foster [<mailto:wickeddel@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Delaina Foster

77024

Consent-Based Siting

From: Will Foster [<mailto:Mywill.foster@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:02 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Will Foster

78717

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carol Fox [<mailto:cfox374@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:06 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carol Fox

76574

Consent-Based Siting

From: Linda Frankel [<mailto:lfp80@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Linda Frankel

76053

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gary Freeman [<mailto:gfree@utexas.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:10 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gary Freeman

79734

Consent-Based Siting

From: Clare Freeman [<mailto:claresfree@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:12 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Clare Freeman

79734

Consent-Based Siting

From: Barbara Fry [mailto:fry.barbara@twc.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:31 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Barbara Fry

78201

Consent-Based Siting

From: Aaron Fuller [<mailto:aaronfarisfuller@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:37 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Aaron Fuller

78256

Consent-Based Siting

From: William Funderburk [<mailto:bhaktab2@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 1:56 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

William Funderburk

75219

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sangeetha Gali [mailto:Sangeetha_gali@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sangeetha Gali

77479

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nora Galindo [<mailto:mexicher@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:11 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nora Galindo

78240

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ken Gantos [mailto:Teamkrg@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ken Gantos

76207

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sars Garcia [<mailto:greencove.drive@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:37 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sars Garcia

75042

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ernesto Garcia [mailto:ernestogpm@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:34 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ernesto Garcia

76262

Consent-Based Siting

From: Yolanda Garrett [<mailto:ygarrett@consolidated.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Yolanda Garrett

77430

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carmela Garritano [<mailto:garritanocj@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carmela Garritano

77802

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary Gianakos [<mailto:texasmaryg1@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:38 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Gianakos

76182

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rhonda Gibson [<mailto:mykegbaby@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rhonda Gibson

78266

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary Gifford [<mailto:mgifford@austin.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Gifford

78731

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sharon Gillespie [<mailto:pretend@austin.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:35 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sharon Gillespie

78703

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carol Ginn [mailto:carol.ginn@utexas.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:47 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carol Ginn

78731

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kathleen Gittel [mailto:squiffer@wildblue.net] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:45 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kathleen Gittel

78642

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nancy Glass [<mailto:nancyglass@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nancy Glass

78722

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jorge I. Gomez [<mailto:jigomez0441@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:55 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jorge I. Gomez

78258

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jean Gonzales [mailto:jhnj_serv@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 8:46 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jean Gonzales

79714

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rafael Gonzalez [<mailto:Rsgonzal12@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rafael Gonzalez

79904

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Gonzalez [<mailto:acerift@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:51 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Gonzalez

78723

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cathy Gordon [<mailto:cgorwriter@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cathy Gordon

77381

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cherie Gorman [<mailto:cgorman@airmail.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:41 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cherie Gorman

77098

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lavina Gorman [<mailto:hottipone@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:33 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lavina Gorman

78382

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elva Granada [mailto:elvalicia@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elva Granada

76124

Consent-Based Siting

From: Pamela Green [<mailto:pmgreen188@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:06 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pamela Green

77303

Consent-Based Siting

From: Judy Greenwood [<mailto:thejude99@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Judy Greenwood

75025

Consent-Based Siting

From: Terence Griffin [mailto:Terence_griffin@shcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Terence Griffin

76063

Consent-Based Siting

From: Thomas A. Guaraldi [<mailto:wolftalker7799@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:27 AM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Thomas A. Guaraldi

77071

Consent-Based Siting

From: Currie H. [<mailto:cwhawk1@ymail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Currie H.

75056

Consent-Based Siting

From: Linda H [<mailto:Lwh93@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Linda H

77301

Consent-Based Siting

From: Arnold Haber [<mailto:arne@arnoldhaber.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:15 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Arnold Haber

78732

Consent-Based Siting

From: Connie Habern [<mailto:Chabern@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Connie Habern

77006

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rolf Habersang [<mailto:rhabersang@aahsllp.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rolf Habersang

79159

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paul Haggard [<mailto:phaggard@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paul Haggard

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: salah hakim [<mailto:hakimsala@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:31 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

salah hakim

76017

Consent-Based Siting

From: Shea L. Hales [<mailto:peacesearchr@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:52 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Shea L. Hales

78418

Consent-Based Siting

From: William Haley [<mailto:handelbarbill@suddenlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

William Haley

79563

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joyce Hall [<mailto:Hallmj@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:15 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joyce Hall

75229

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marilyn Hamaker [<mailto:maralyn4444@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:27 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marilyn Hamaker

75208

Consent-Based Siting

From: Delicia Jackie Handel [<mailto:jackie.handel@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:23 AM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

We don't need nuclear power if we have wind, water and solar power, without endangering any one.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Delicia Jackie Handel

77373

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kevin Hanlon [<mailto:khanlon@smu.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kevin Hanlon

75002

Consent-Based Siting

From: Yvonne Hansen, EdD [<mailto:yvonnehanseninaustin@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:00 AM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I strongly oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should and must be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people did not even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people who stated opposition to the Andrews County site and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the

disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Yvonne Hansen, EdD

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Amanda Haralson [<mailto:amandaharalson3@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Amanda Haralson

75931

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gary hardie [<mailto:garhardie@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:01 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gary hardie

76710

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Hardwick [<mailto:ishmail75062@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:07 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Hardwick

75062

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jay Harlan [<mailto:jhmotjr@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jay Harlan

77041

Consent-Based Siting

From: Judith L Harman [<mailto:jlhftworth@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:18 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Judith L Harman

76109

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Harris [<mailto:jaharris37@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Harris

75023

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rick Hart [<mailto:rick@rickhart.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rick Hart

78752

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kathe Haskell [<mailto:katheprints@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kathe Haskell

75251

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paul Hatch [<mailto:paskosoul@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paul Hatch

77014

Consent-Based Siting

From: ken hayes [<mailto:kenhayes50@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:57 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

ken hayes

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kristi Hayner [mailto:kristi@touchofgreen.net] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kristi Hayner

78602

Consent-Based Siting

From: Noel Haynes [<mailto:nehaynes36@msn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Noel Haynes

76021

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary Helton [mailto:mary_0926@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:38 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Helton

79925

Consent-Based Siting

From: lori Henderson [<mailto:lori@vedatech.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

lori Henderson

78746

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nancy Hentschel [<mailto:Nancy6610@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I radically oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Also, what is wrong with elected officials that you don't protect your constituents until we are looking?

Nancy Hentschel

77469

Consent-Based Siting

From: catherine herrin [mailto:cathy.herrin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:00 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

catherine herrin

77803

Consent-Based Siting

From: Annette Herrington [<mailto:jimannette2@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:55 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Annette Herrington

76354

Consent-Based Siting

From: Derrick Heyward [<mailto:SDawg322@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:38 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Derrick Heyward

77477

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rebecca Hill [mailto:rebeccahill66@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:33 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based
siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rebecca Hill

77019

Consent-Based Siting

From: DORIS HINES [<mailto:dphines1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:37 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

DORIS HINES

75038

Consent-Based Siting

From: Beverly Hoff [<mailto:bash16803@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:33 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Beverly Hoff

78660

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jerry Hofrock [<mailto:notebanker@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jerry Hofrock

78613

Consent-Based Siting

From: Amanda Hollis [<mailto:Amandahollis82@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:08 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Amanda Hollis

76021

Consent-Based Siting

From: Vicki Holmes [<mailto:vholmes2@swbell.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:19 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Vicki Holmes

77389

Consent-Based Siting

From: Reva Holmes [<mailto:revaholmes@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:27 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Reva Holmes

76527

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carolyn Holtz [<mailto:carolyn.holtz@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:44 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carolyn Holtz

77047

Consent-Based Siting

From: M. Hondros [<mailto:mlhondros@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

M. Hondros

77058

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Horne [<mailto:donhana1946@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement. Basta! nomasno!

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Horne

78209

Consent-Based Siting

From: Harriet S Horton [<mailto:harriet.s.horton@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:47 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Harriet S Horton

78613

Consent-Based Siting

From: Christina Huckaba [<mailto:christinahuckabd@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Christina Huckaba

78006

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sandra Huey [<mailto:sandyann@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:31 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sandra Huey

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rande Hughes [<mailto:rhrh0000@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:54 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Randee Hughes

76177

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lee Hutchings [mailto:lehut@live.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:25 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lee Hutchings

76301

Consent-Based Siting

From: Richard Hutchings [mailto:rickhutchings@tx.rr.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:33 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Richard Hutchings

75043

Consent-Based Siting

From: Martha Walker Hutson [mailto:Momcatsmac@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Martha Walker Hutson

79605

Consent-Based Siting

From: RICK ILGIN [<mailto:rilgin@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

RICK ILGIN

75039

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Ille [mailto:robertille2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:48 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based
siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Ille

75224

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ann Isaacson [<mailto:ann@bluepaw.org>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ann Isaacson

77365

Consent-Based Siting

From: Stephanie Islas [mailto:islas16@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Stephanie Islas

77057

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jodi Ismert [<mailto:Jodi915@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jodi Ismert

76201

Consent-Based Siting

From: Andrew Jackson [mailto:pamryans25@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Andrew Jackson

77047

Consent-Based Siting

From: Laura Jacobs [mailto:ljacobsdallas@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:07 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Laura Jacobs

75208

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gregory Joel [<mailto:joelg121@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gregory Joel

76108

Consent-Based Siting

From: Do Johns [<mailto:twittawa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:13 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Do Johns

77510

Consent-Based Siting

From: Wendy Jones [<mailto:Sadiecat10@yahoo.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:02 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Wendy Jones

75065

Consent-Based Siting

From: John K [<mailto:john.jckuyks@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:12 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John K

78676

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rebecca Kahn [<mailto:rebeccajkahn@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 3:18 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rebecca Kahn

78777

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marie Karpinsky [<mailto:mkarpinsky@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:44 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marie Karpinsky

77041

Consent-Based Siting

From: Steven G. Kellman [mailto:kellman1@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Steven G. Kellman

78231

Consent-Based Siting

From: William Kennedy [<mailto:Wdkneedville@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

William Kennedy

77461

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ann Kennedy [<mailto:akennedy123@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ann Kennedy

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Ketterman [<mailto:Kingpig444@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Ketterman

76541

Consent-Based Siting

From: JEFF KILBOURNE [<mailto:JLKHOTRODS@AOL.COM>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:13 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

JEFF KILBOURNE

79912

Consent-Based Siting

From: Anna Kilbourne [<mailto:akilbourne@austin.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

My NOTE:

TRANSPORTING DEADLY WASTE TO TEXAS....."DON"T MESS WITH TEXAS!!!!!!

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Anna Kilbourne

78734

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Kilbourne [<mailto:dkilbourne@austin.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:45 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

My personal comment first: "The best laid plans of mice and men often go awry". A lifelong Texan, I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site. **TEXANS HAVE BEEN IN A DROUGHT FOR DECADES!!!! WHY WOULD YOU EVEN TAKE THE SLIGHTEST OF CHANCES WITH O_U_R W_A_T_E_R!!!!**

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes

must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Kilbourne

78734

Consent-Based Siting

From: jack kirfman [<mailto:jkirfman@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

jack kirfman

78717

Consent-Based Siting

From: Russell Kirk [mailto:mollymax09@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:31 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Russell Kirk

76834

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gabriel KIRKPATRICK [mailto:g_kirkpatrick@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:33 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gabriel KIRKPATRICK

76207

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jimmie Kizer [<mailto:jimmiedkizer@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jimmie Kizer

75686

Consent-Based Siting

From: victoria kniery [<mailto:rvkniery@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:50 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

victoria kniery

79925

Consent-Based Siting

From: Annika Knight [<mailto:annikat@comcast.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Annika Knight

77573

Consent-Based Siting

From: ANITA KNIGHT [<mailto:anitaknight10@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:01 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

To: DEA Officials & Decision-Makers

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste to Texas. The health and safety risks to communities all across the country is FAR TOO GREAT! Not to mention the imminent threat to the Ogallala Aquifer.

Instead, DOE should establish a permanent disposal site GUARANTEEING NO CONTAMINATION -- EVER. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly FROM TEXANS (AND not TEXAS LEGISLATORS, many of whom are already proven to be corrupted by corporate and special interest monies).

This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues (there's the CORRUPTION card again!), but local people are OPPOSED to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County -- or ANYWHERE in TEXAS. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

The DEA MUST step back from this process and rethink its strategy to eliminate risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments. You may call me if you want further information. Anita A. Knight

ANITA KNIGHT

76702

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jason kovach [<mailto:jason.kovach@bakerhughes.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jason kovach

77064

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dorothy Kraemer [<mailto:dorothykraemer@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dorothy Kraemer

78660

Consent-Based Siting

From: William Krause [mailto:xkrause@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

William Krause

77077

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Krone [<mailto:152flyer@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Krone

76124

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jan Kutchen [<mailto:jkutchen@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:29 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jan Kutchen

78209

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lily Laija [<mailto:llaija@elp.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lily Laija

79927

Consent-Based Siting

From: Victor Laitinen [<mailto:vicl@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:43 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Victor Laitinen

78727

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary Lam [<mailto:L.Lam33@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:01 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Lam

78727

Consent-Based Siting

From: Pamela Lanagan [<mailto:planagan44@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pamela Lanagan

75965

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gerry Lanctot [<mailto:gturtle22@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:12 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gerry Lanctot

78028

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jerry Landers [<mailto:landersjerrydon@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jerry Landers

78642

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elizabeth A. Landers [<mailto:Sinixdenis@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:30 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elizabeth A. Landers

78230

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jennifer Lane [<mailto:jenrlane@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jennifer Lane

76205

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rev. Marilyn Gallaway Lange [<mailto:newbeginningslutheranchurch@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:16 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rev. Marilyn Gallaway Lange

78148

Consent-Based Siting

From: Margie Langford [<mailto:mlangford532@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:54 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Margie Langford

76053

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gail Larimer [<mailto:gailbernice@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gail Larimer

78757

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dy Larson [<mailto:dynula-reg@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:03 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dy Larson

78753

Consent-Based Siting

From: sandra l lawrence [<mailto:catlady@ktc.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

sandra l lawrence

78028

Consent-Based Siting

From: Fran Leatherwood [<mailto:franleatherwood@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:59 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Fran Leatherwood

77566

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lisa LeBlanc [<mailto:1619austin@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:31 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lisa LeBlanc

78749

Consent-Based Siting

From: Thomas Lehman [<mailto:thomas.lehman@verizon.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Thomas Lehman

76205

Consent-Based Siting

From: Linda Lester [<mailto:lstellma@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:11 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Linda Lester

78130

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ronald Levick [<mailto:Littlejack187@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 6:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ronald Levick

78654

Consent-Based Siting

From: michele lewis [<mailto:micHELina411@msn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:05 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

michele lewis

77076

Consent-Based Siting

From: Wayne Lewis [<mailto:waynelewisx@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:18 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Wayne Lewis

79424

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ashley Lierman [<mailto:arlierma@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ashley Lierman

77035

Consent-Based Siting

From: Laura Liles [mailto:laura.anne.liles@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:09 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based
siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Laura Liles

77009

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kenton Lindley [mailto:ken_kc_959@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:49 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kenton Lindley

77381

Consent-Based Siting

From: Steve Lininger [<mailto:slininger49er@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Steve Lininger

75052

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marc Lionetti [<mailto:theface514@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:33 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marc Lionetti

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Litwins [<mailto:ufee94@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Litwins

75075

Consent-Based Siting

From: grace Liu [<mailto:xyz.street8@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

grace Liu

75081

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sue Liu [mailto:tcyliutx@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:49 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sue Liu

77479

Consent-Based Siting

From: Suzanne Livesey [<mailto:Sblivesey@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Suzanne Livesey

76180

Consent-Based Siting

From: Liz Chapa [mailto:echapa1207@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Liz Chapa

78380

Consent-Based Siting

From: Stephen Locke [<mailto:txlonewolf903@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:25 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Stephen Locke

75418

Consent-Based Siting

From: LEE LOE [<mailto:leeloe@igc.org>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:31 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

LEE LOE

77098

Consent-Based Siting

From: Anna Loera [mailto:annandernest@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Anna Loera

77339

Consent-Based Siting

From: t logan logan [<mailto:telogan14@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:27 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

t logan logan

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Barbara Lohff [<mailto:sanchez-lohff@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:07 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Barbara Lohff

77079

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mark Lokensgard [<mailto:mark.lokensgard@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:07 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mark Lokensgard

78254

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rachel Long [<mailto:racheljanettelong@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:27 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rachel Long

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Linda Look [<mailto:l.look@shcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:33 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Linda Look

77062

Consent-Based Siting

From: Randy Lopez [mailto:chauncey_945@outlook.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Randy Lopez

77573

Consent-Based Siting

From: belen lopez-deleon [<mailto:monchou36@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

belen lopez-deleon

78413

Consent-Based Siting

From: N Lovell [<mailto:Nlove08054@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:13 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

N Lovell

78641

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Lowe [<mailto:jameslowe43@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Lowe

78653

Consent-Based Siting

From: Julio Sanchez Lucas [mailto:julios_1994@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:50 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Julio Sanchez Lucas

75217

Consent-Based Siting

From: steve lucas [<mailto:slucas78704@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:33 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

steve lucas

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lisa Lucko-Powell [<mailto:luckolisa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:25 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lisa Lucko-Powell

76520

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joan Ludvik [<mailto:jludtxs@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:12 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joan Ludvik

77657

Consent-Based Siting

From: Susan Luton [mailto:susanluton@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Susan Luton

78737

Consent-Based Siting

From: Alice M [<mailto:xeromancer@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:37 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Alice M

78645

Consent-Based Siting

From: francesca machock [mailto:frankiefivetimes@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:09 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

francesca machock

77036

Consent-Based Siting

From: Bonnie Lynn MacKinnon [<mailto:bmackinnonwitherspoon@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:58 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bonnie Lynn MacKinnon

78626

Consent-Based Siting

From: Eva Malina [<mailto:eamalina@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Eva Malina

77414

Consent-Based Siting

From: Louis Marick [mailto:doug_marick@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:02 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Louis Marick

75752

Consent-Based Siting

From: Todd Marquart [<mailto:Myprop71@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:28 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Todd Marquart

75342

Consent-Based Siting

From: Morris Martin [mailto:morrismart@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Morris Martin

76201

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ingrid Martine [<mailto:coach@ingridmartine.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:53 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ingrid Martine

76689

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ruben Martinez [<mailto:neburzenitram@icloud.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:41 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ruben Martinez

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: E. C. Marullo [<mailto:ecm1@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

E. C. Marullo

76110

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kevin Mason [<mailto:Kscottmason@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:48 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kevin Mason

78721

Consent-Based Siting

From: Janet Mattern [<mailto:Jmatt7875@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 12:13 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Janet Mattern

76132

Consent-Based Siting

From: Matje Mattern [<mailto:mkmattern@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 12:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Matje Mattern

76116

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elizabeth Maupin [<mailto:emaupin@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elizabeth Maupin

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Margaret Maxwell [<mailto:freakingzoolady@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 11:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Margaret Maxwell

75238

Consent-Based Siting

From: Leah May [<mailto:Leahgmay@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:02 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Leah May

78729

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carmen McBride [<mailto:cebegnaud@aol.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:18 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carmen McBride

75165

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patricia McCain [mailto:tillypat_mccain@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:54 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patricia McCain

77808

Consent-Based Siting

From: James L. McCall [<mailto:revjamesmccall@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James L. McCall

75214

Consent-Based Siting

From: Edward McCann [<mailto:edwardlme@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:03 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Edward McCann

75227/7819

Consent-Based Siting

From: Helen Mccarthy [<mailto:Schmelen@gmail.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:30 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Helen Mccarthy

78641

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robin McCarty [<mailto:Robinmccarty2@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:58 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robin McCarty

78411

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mickey McCarty [<mailto:mickey.mccarty@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mickey McCarty

79606

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rebecca McCleskey [<mailto:revkajewel@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:26 AM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rebecca McCleskey

78664

Consent-Based Siting

From: George McDill [<mailto:togmatsa@yahoo.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

George McDill

78216

Consent-Based Siting

From: Raejean McDonald [<mailto:firstcavmom@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:05 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Raejean McDonald

76549

Consent-Based Siting

From: Pam McGee [<mailto:pamelam2@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pam McGee

77389

Consent-Based Siting

From: Victoria McGrady [<mailto:Victoria.mcgrady@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Victoria McGrady

78231

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Mckissick [<mailto:jamesmaddress@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Mckissick

77414

Consent-Based Siting

From: Phil MCQUEARY [<mailto:fairliephil@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:12 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Phil MCQUEARY

75496

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joseph McReynolds [<mailto:jbmcreynolds@austin.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:17 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joseph McReynolds

78703

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kirk Medland [mailto:ktmeds@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kirk Medland

77080

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mona Mehdy [<mailto:mcmehdym@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mona Mehdy

78727

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kathryn Melton [<mailto:zappa2004@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:31 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kathryn Melton

77536

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jesus Mercado [<mailto:b5ct2l@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:47 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jesus Mercado

77060

Consent-Based Siting

From: Susan Metcalfe [mailto:smetcalfe4911@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Susan Metcalfe

78676

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ari Meyer [mailto:ari_meyer@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:36 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ari Meyer

78735

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sara Michaels [<mailto:suetx1956@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sara Michaels

76656

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Mick [mailto:robertmick@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:51 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Mick

78758

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Mikus [<mailto:mikuslaw@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Mikus

78940

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tim Milam [<mailto:broncstim@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:07 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tim Milam

78572

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ann E Miller [<mailto:anniemiller@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ann E Miller

76301

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Miller [mailto:riorondal@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Miller

79830

Consent-Based Siting

From: Brian Miller [<mailto:brianmiller.bcm@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:26 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Brian Miller

78757

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jane Miller [mailto:jmiller_miller0@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jane Miller

77808

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dave Mills [<mailto:lockhartrealty@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:26 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dave Mills

78644

Consent-Based Siting

From: AK Mirle [<mailto:akmirle2003@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

AK Mirle

75025

Consent-Based Siting

From: Brenda Moczygamba [mailto:Bjm3619@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Brenda Moczygemba

78258

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tony Mojica [<mailto:antmojica@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tony Mojica

79925

Consent-Based Siting

From: L Molinar [mailto:Lucy_pedregon_molinar@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:29 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

IT IS NOT A FAIR DECISION BECAUSE IT IS BEING MADE VERY QUIETLY AS NOT TO LET THE PUBLIC KNOW, SO OBJECTIONS WON'T ARISE. NONE OF THESE INDIVIDUALS GAINING FROM THESE DECISIONS WOULD "NOT" WANT TO BE LIVING ANY WHERE NEAR IT. OUR ACQUIFERS ARE VITAL TO OUR ENVIRONMENT....THE ONES THAT ARE BEING EFFECTED ARE THE NEXT GENERATION....THE CHILDREN....GOOD LUCK WITH YOUR CONSCIOUS IF YOU MAKE THE ILL DECISION TO CONTINUE TO CONTAMINATE TEXAS...IF THEY HAVE ONE.

L Molinar

79836

Consent-Based Siting

From: Suzanne Montalalou [<mailto:slmontalalou@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:03 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Suzanne Montalalou

78666

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary L. Montenegro [<mailto:marylpena@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary L. Montenegro

77346

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rowena Montgomery [<mailto:rofimo7@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rowena Montgomery

76017

Consent-Based Siting

From: gary moore [<mailto:garymo78884@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:43 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

gary moore

78884

Consent-Based Siting

From: J. A. Moore [mailto:moore43ja@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:09 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

LOOK, this proposed site isn't that far away from where I live (yes, I'm playing the NIMBY card because the train carrying that waste might come through MY city). WILL that stuff be coming through Lubbock? You shouldn't be making a final decision until the EIS is completed.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

J. A. Moore

79414

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lorraine Moore [<mailto:lorraine@lorraineshirkus.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:20 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lorraine Moore

78210

Consent-Based Siting

From: J J Moran [<mailto:jjrmoran@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

J J Moran

77401

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rashida Morgan [<mailto:negriral642@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:40 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rashida Morgan

77339

Consent-Based Siting

From: KAREN MORRIS [<mailto:eringokaren@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:57 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

KAREN MORRIS

78261

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Morris [<mailto:dholmesmorris@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:56 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Morris

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Anne Morton [<mailto:dr.anne@annemorton.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:37 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Anne Morton

75219

Consent-Based Siting

From: Wendy Mueller [mailto:dragon2wolf76053@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:43 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Wendy Mueller

76148

Consent-Based Siting

From: Morgan Mujica [<mailto:Luckstar1133@aol.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 11:27 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Morgan Mujica

79714

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jon Mullin [<mailto:jmullin422@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:40 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jon Mullin

75062

Consent-Based Siting

From: Martin Mullins [<mailto:jayroe2@suddenlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:17 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Martin Mullins

79423

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joan Murdoch [<mailto:joaniesigns@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:05 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joan Murdoch

77365

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Murdoch [<mailto:rsbob2@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Murdoch

77365

Consent-Based Siting

From: Michael Murphy [<mailto:murphylandarch@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:35 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Michael Murphy

76856

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dyan Muse [mailto:museann@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:38 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dyan Muse

77611

Consent-Based Siting

From: R Nelson [<mailto:elsonnay@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:18 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

R Nelson

78640

Consent-Based Siting

From: Evelyn Nemec [<mailto:nemec.eve@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Evelyn Nemec

75088

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lana Neukirch [<mailto:neulan0507@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:29 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lana Neukirch

78232

Consent-Based Siting

From: Fred Newberry [<mailto:fjnewberry@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Fred Newberry

78748

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carol Nichols [<mailto:ckitnichols@msn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:32 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carol Nichols

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Melody Night [mailto:twilightsmelody@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:45 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Melody Night

75165

Consent-Based Siting

From: Terri Norman [<mailto:terrienormannc@aol.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:05 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Terri Norman

77008

Consent-Based Siting

From: Diane Nosnik [<mailto:Dianenosnik@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:53 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Diane Nosnik

75093

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rex Nunnally [<mailto:rexnunnally@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:35 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rex Nunnally

78731

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elizabeth ODear [<mailto:ekodear@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:25 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elizabeth ODear

77401

Consent-Based Siting

From: Roby & Barbara Odom [<mailto:msodom@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:27 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Roby & Barbara Odom

75230

Consent-Based Siting

From: Harry Ogg [<mailto:oggmanhwo@outlook.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:05 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Harry Ogg

79701

Consent-Based Siting

From: George Ohlendorf [mailto:george_ohlendorf@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

George Ohlendorf

78628

Consent-Based Siting

From: Catherine Oleksiw [mailto:coleksiw@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Catherine Oleksiw

75093

Consent-Based Siting

From: Anthony Olivares [<mailto:anth5546@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 4:23 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Anthony Olivares

77009

Consent-Based Siting

From: Diana Orren [<mailto:Gramdee0124@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Diana Orren

78754

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carol Ortiz [<mailto:mazola0523@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carol Ortiz

77316

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tyler Osborne [mailto:Tyler.dane.osborne@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:32 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tyler Osborne

66

Consent-Based Siting

From: Theo Ostler [<mailto:tostler@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Theo Ostler

77027

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joyce Overton [<mailto:doverton19@verizon.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:28 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joyce Overton

75088

Consent-Based Siting

From: Leslie Pagan [<mailto:LAPagan210@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:14 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Leslie Pagan

77539

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nancy Paine [<mailto:lnep78750@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nancy Paine

78750

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jo Palmer [mailto:hpcdirect@att.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:54 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jo Palmer

79543

Consent-Based Siting

From: Minelle and Jonathan Paloff [<mailto:paloffm40@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:44 AM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Minelle and Jonathan Paloff

75455

Consent-Based Siting

From: Diana Parish [<mailto:creatorsunlimited@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:17 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Diana Parish

77353

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elizabeth Park [mailto:Awwwwmiss@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:30 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elizabeth Park

77591

Consent-Based Siting

From: Craig Parker [mailto:craig_parker@att.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Craig Parker

76137

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ronald Parry [<mailto:parry@rice.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:51 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ronald Parry

77057

Consent-Based Siting

From: Frank Patterson [<mailto:franksbox2011@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Frank Patterson

78724

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patricia Patteson [<mailto:ppatteson@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:17 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patricia Patteson

78023

Consent-Based Siting

From: J R Peacock [<mailto:jrpeacock1@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:15 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

J R Peacock

76103

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paula Pedersen [<mailto:gillybean63@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:30 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paula Pedersen

78148

Consent-Based Siting

From: Clara Pelaez [mailto:Claritape_80@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:46 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Clara Pelaez

75219

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elisabeth Pelham [mailto:epelham@designworks-gallery.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elisabeth Pelham

77550

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lilli Pell [<mailto:lilli@lillipell.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:25 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lilli Pell

78676

Consent-Based Siting

From: DANTE PENA [<mailto:danterpena65@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:56 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

DANTE PENA

78503

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ravi Perera [mailto:raviper@hal-pc.org]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:50 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ravi Perera

77042

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rebecc Peres [<mailto:Ctppageant@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:19 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rebecca Peres

78382

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joaquina Perry [<mailto:jrlperry@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joaquina Perry

77062

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ed Perry [<mailto:edpgsa@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:21 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ed Perry

78132

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Perry [<mailto:prryrbri@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Perry

75708

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ruthanne Peterson [mailto:Peterson_ruthanne@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:43 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ruthanne Peterson

77027

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lincoln Pettaway [<mailto:lpettawa2003@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lincoln Pettaway

77067

Consent-Based Siting

From: CECIL PHILIP [<mailto:CECILKPHILIP@HOTMAIL.COM>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:18 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

CECIL PHILIP

75056

Consent-Based Siting

From: Clare Piaget [<mailto:cpiaget@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:23 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Clare Piaget

77007

Consent-Based Siting

From: Derrell Pitcock [<mailto:derrellp@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Derrell Pitcock

76245

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sean Pitstick [mailto:seanbox13@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:45 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sean Pitstick

78757

Consent-Based Siting

From: Casey Pittman [<mailto:pittman.casey@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:54 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Casey Pittman

75019

Consent-Based Siting

From: Katie Pitts [<mailto:kpitts85@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:52 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Katie Pitts

78758

Consent-Based Siting

From: KARL POINTER [<mailto:pointerkarl@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

KARL POINTER

76133

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marsha Poppy [<mailto:sasha3731@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:15 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marsha Poppy

88012

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Porretto [mailto:john@verdecapitalresources.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:54 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Porretto

77005

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rick Potthoff [<mailto:poeducker@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:00 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rick Potthoff

77080

Consent-Based Siting

From: Byron Pratt [<mailto:b54oramaster@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:08 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Byron Pratt

78701

Consent-Based Siting

From: jennifer prevost [<mailto:jennifermprevost@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:05 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

jennifer prevost

78213

Consent-Based Siting

From: Catherine Price-Carrejo [mailto:catherine.price@baesystems.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Catherine Price-Carrejo

78665

Consent-Based Siting

From: Therese Progar [<mailto:tprogar1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 12:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Therese Progar

75082

Consent-Based Siting

From: Deboir Quick [<mailto:ngwtrust@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Deboir Quick

77099

Consent-Based Siting

From: Alonso Ramirez [<mailto:alonsoramirez0241@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:47 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Alonso Ramirez

78839

Consent-Based Siting

From: Eric Ramirez [<mailto:Erami25@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:07 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Eric Ramirez

77504

Consent-Based Siting

From: Heather Ramon [<mailto:heatherr409@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Heather Ramon

79339

Consent-Based Siting

From: Bobbi Ravicz [<mailto:bobbibooks@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:19 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bobbi Ravicz

78209

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dona Readinger [mailto:donaayre@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dona Readinger

76107

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ray Reece [<mailto:rayreece69@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:22 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ray Reece

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: curtis rehfluss [<mailto:c302@suddenlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

curtis rehfuss

78633

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kelli Reid [<mailto:kelli.reid@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 10:02 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kelli Reid

75001

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jason Reinhardt [mailto:jreinhardt9@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:46 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jason Reinhardt

77025

Consent-Based Siting

From: Piero Rondoni [<mailto:astarkasster@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:09 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Piero Rondoni

77088

Consent-Based Siting

From: lauro Reveles [mailto:lauroaustin@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:03 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

lauro Reveles

78763

Consent-Based Siting

From: Isaiah Reynoso [mailto:reynoso08@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:35 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Isaiah Reynoso

76105

Consent-Based Siting

From: Isaias Reynoso [mailto:reynosoi40@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:37 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Isaias Reynoso

76105

Consent-Based Siting

From: Josh Rhodes [<mailto:jrhodes27@me.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:53 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Josh Rhodes

77662

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jim Rice [mailto:cleotisleeroy1@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:54 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jim Rice

77520

Consent-Based Siting

From: Claudia Richner [<mailto:claudia.richner@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:09 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Claudia Richner

78028

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sr. Elizabeth Riebschlaeger, ccv Riebschlaeger, ccvi [<mailto:elzrccvi@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:45 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

Texas is already struggling with tons of fracking waste, some of which has contaminated our water. There is dumping of VOC's by the tons into our air, and soil contamination occurring around pads with flares. We do not need radioactive waste from outside Texas, too.

Therefore, I am adamantly opposed to the shipping of high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won't know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation's high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn't one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sr. Elizabeth Riebschlaeger, ccv Riebschlaeger, ccvi

77901

Consent-Based Siting

From: Coy Riggin [mailto:coy.riggin@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Coy Riggan

79106

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jeff Rister [mailto:Jeffrist_1999@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:00 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jeff Rister

77095

Consent-Based Siting

From: Bob Roberts [<mailto:Bobr1948@icloud.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bob Roberts

78664

Consent-Based Siting

From: Rena Roberts [<mailto:bigbirdlady@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:46 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rena Roberts

78250

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marija Robey [<mailto:marijarobey@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marija Robey

78641

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cheryl Robison [<mailto:beaglemom@charter.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:27 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cheryl Robison

76107

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sean Robison [<mailto:seanrobison65@shcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sean Robison

75056

Consent-Based Siting

From: Olivia Rodriguez [<mailto:obrodri@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:16 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Olivia Rodriguez

78759

Consent-Based Siting

From: Richard Rodriguez [<mailto:rickyrlxiv064@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Richard Rodriguez

78245

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cheryl Rogers [<mailto:cherierogers@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:26 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cheryl Rogers

76634

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dirk Rogers [<mailto:1dog2dogs3dogs@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dirk Rogers

75204

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joe Rogers [<mailto:jwat2@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joe Rogers

78768

Consent-Based Siting

From: Molly Rooke [<mailto:mollyrooke@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 12:55 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Molly Rooke

75206

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ann Roos [<mailto:dfmi1@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:53 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ann Roos

77968

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sheila Rosart [<mailto:sheila@rosart-brodnitz.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:38 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone. I am horrified by the idea let alone the reality. I do not want am myself or my children anywhere near a radioactive waste facility.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sheila Rosart

78212

Consent-Based Siting

From: Alan Rose [<mailto:Alrose3000@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Alan Rose

78739

Consent-Based Siting

From: Patricia Rosenblad [<mailto:patrarose@austin.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:17 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Patricia Rosenblad

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Garry Ross [<mailto:g.ross10nagas@gmail.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Garry Ross

77058

Consent-Based Siting

From: Homero Morales [<mailto:homer-m@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:48 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Homero Morales

78130

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Ryan [<mailto:ryanj@tamug.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:05 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Ryan

77598

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nancy Sagafi-nejad [<mailto:nancyblackesq@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever be moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

The Department of Energy should step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nancy Sagafi-nejad

78043

Consent-Based Siting

From: William Sanders [<mailto:allensand@mindspring.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

William Sanders

78759

Consent-Based Siting

From: Diane Sanders [mailto:lady_sanders@gmail.com] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:23 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Diane Sanders

77057

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sonia Santana [<mailto:sonia.santana@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sonia Santana

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: Colleen SAUNDERS [<mailto:colleen.saunders@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Colleen SAUNDERS

76001

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dorothy Schleicher [mailto:Dorothy_Schleicher@baylor.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:00 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dorothy Schleicher

76710

Consent-Based Siting

From: Susan Schlueter [<mailto:susan76207@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Susan Schlueter

76207

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paul Schmidt [<mailto:paulhome@computerevaluations.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paul Schmidt

75214

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary Emily Schultz [<mailto:mschultz@hal-pc.org>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I firmly endorse all of the comments and rationale presented below in this letter to you! I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in

Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Emily Schultz

77009

Consent-Based Siting

From: Glenn Scott [mailto:Glenns1048@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:35 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Glenn Scott

78723

Consent-Based Siting

From: Julie Sears [<mailto:jcsears@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Julie Sears

75080

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mary R Seely [<mailto:donmarseely@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:33 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary R Seely

77079

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joshua Seff [<mailto:mv9508@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joshua Seff

75070

Consent-Based Siting

From: Leah Sellers [mailto:leahwildcow@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Leah Sellers

78627

Consent-Based Siting

From: Greg Sells [<mailto:gsells@austin.rr.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 9:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Greg Sells

78741

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kelly Semlear [<mailto:ksemlear@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kelly Semlear

75604

Consent-Based Siting

From: Judi Shafer [<mailto:Jsoquality@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:16 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Judi Shafer

75204

Consent-Based Siting

From: Deborah Shafto [<mailto:Debshafto@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:45 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Deborah Shafto

77061

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ron Sheffield [<mailto:ronniesheffield@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:45 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ron Sheffield

77512

Consent-Based Siting

From: Morgan Shelhorse [<mailto:Captain1971@msn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Morgan Shelhorse

75104

Consent-Based Siting

From: Phil Shephard [<mailto:philshephard@live.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:21 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Phil Shephard

78681

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jaclyn Shepherd [<mailto:jacksshep@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:29 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jaclyn Shepherd

78209

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kat Shield [<mailto:ktshield@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:19 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kat Shield

76878

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lynn Shigekawa [<mailto:Lshigeka@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:04 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lynn Shigekawa

77546

Consent-Based Siting

From: Michelle Shipman [mailto:mshipman@usa.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:17 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Michelle Shipman

78217

Consent-Based Siting

From: Eugene Shubert [<mailto:zog.hasfallen@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:33 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Eugene Shubert

75081

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gayle Shumate [<mailto:furaddicted@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:14 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of

funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

The people of Texas did not get to vote for this project. This was a special project Rick Perry put through for his rich friend. It does nothing to enhance the lives of Texans but does enrich the pocket book of Rick's already rich buddy. Don't put my health and safety at risk so Rick Perry's friend can get richer.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gayle Shumate

76082

Consent-Based Siting

From: Christiaan Siano [<mailto:cxiaan@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:41 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Christiaan Siano

78723

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kenneth Sickler [<mailto:kenneth.sickler@verizon.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:22 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kenneth Sickler

76244

Consent-Based Siting

From: Aftab Siddiqui [<mailto:aftab.a.siddiqui@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:14 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Aftab Siddiqui

76002

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dario Sifuentes [<mailto:dsifuentes1@tx.rr.com>] Sent:
Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:13 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dario Sifuentes

75080

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cathy Simmons [mailto:mllcathy@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:32 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cathy Simmons

78722

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sheila Simonson [mailto:sheila_lynn@verizon.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:14 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sheila Simonson

77808

Consent-Based Siting

From: Pauline Singleton [<mailto:pollytx1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:37 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pauline Singleton

77521

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sharon L Smatana [mailto:smatana@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:44 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sharon L Smatana

77070

Consent-Based Siting

From: Virginia Smith [mailto:jinstevens@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting
<consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov> Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Virginia Smith

75156

Consent-Based Siting

From: William C Smith [mailto:12wsmith@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

William C Smith

76021

Consent-Based Siting

From: Amy Smith [<mailto:amycoli@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:00 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Amy Smith

77627

Consent-Based Siting

From: Frances Smith [<mailto:Patsyd32@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:49 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Frances Smith

78201

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Smith [<mailto:edsmithparis@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Smith

78746

Consent-Based Siting

From: Leslie Smith [<mailto:tangelt@live.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:31 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Leslie Smith

78666

Consent-Based Siting

From: meredith smith [<mailto:meredithsmith@consolidated.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:07 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

meredith smith

75915

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ronald Smith [<mailto:Dalronalds@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:41 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ronald Smith

75228

Consent-Based Siting

From: Charles Sobeck [<mailto:cscsobeck@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:39 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Charles Sobeck

78133

Consent-Based Siting

From: Michael Solis [<mailto:Lmsolisoftx@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:55 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Michael Solis

77573

Consent-Based Siting

From: adriana soliz [<mailto:apsoliz05@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

adriana soliz

78379

Consent-Based Siting

From: Margie Sorley [mailto:Mjsorley@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Margie Sorley

79413

Consent-Based Siting

From: Randy Southers [mailto:randy_southers@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:50 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Randy Southers

78757

Consent-Based Siting

From: Annette Spanhel [mailto:aspanhel@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Annette Spanhel

78619

Consent-Based Siting

From: laura st.clair [mailto:laura.l@emailaccount.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

laura st.clair

78028

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Starkey [<mailto:Starkey.gil@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 11:34 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Starkey

78723

Consent-Based Siting

From: Deborah Stedman [<mailto:ds43@txststate.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:10 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Deborah Stedman

78737

Consent-Based Siting

From: art steele [<mailto:aesteele32@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:39 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

art steele

78681

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cletus stein [<mailto:cletus@arn.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:45 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cletus stein

79106

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dustin Stephens [<mailto:fourwindsfaire1@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:03 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dustin Stephens

75791

Consent-Based Siting

From: Anne Gomez Sterrett [<mailto:aegomezsterrett@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:24 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Anne Gomez Sterrett

78731

Consent-Based Siting

From: h. keith mephodie sterzing [<mailto:sterzing1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:16 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

h. keith mephodie sterzing

78613

Consent-Based Siting

From: Elisabeth Steves [<mailto:Quantum.center.voice@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:51 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Elisabeth Steves

77004

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sharron Stewart [<mailto:sharronstewart@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:43 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sharron Stewart

77566

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lorelei Stierlen [<mailto:gator.clips@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:34 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lorelei Stierlen

75075

Consent-Based Siting

From: Karoyn Stilwell [<mailto:karoynstilwell@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:23 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Karoyl Stilwell

75563

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jennings Stone [<mailto:Jenningsbryan2001@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:12 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jennings Stone

76182

Consent-Based Siting

From: stuart Stong [mailto:firemanstubaby@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

stuart Stong

77386

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kenneth Struck [<mailto:kstruck4@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kenneth Struck

78738

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mariu Suarez [<mailto:mariusita@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mariu Suarez

76123

Consent-Based Siting

From: Federico Subervi [<mailto:subervi@latinosandmedia.org>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:06 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Federico Subervi

78759

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paul Sullivan [<mailto:lithium451@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paul Sullivan

76132

Consent-Based Siting

From: Joan Susman [<mailto:Josusman@tx.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:10 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joan Susman

75240

Consent-Based Siting

From: Raymond Tarpley [<mailto:rjtarpley@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Raymond Tarpley

77840

Consent-Based Siting

From: Victor Tavis [<mailto:vtavis@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:40 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Victor Tavis

78733

Consent-Based Siting

From: Tim Taylor [<mailto:Austinimageresearch@icloud.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:48 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tim Taylor

78659

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Thacker [<mailto:haybale12@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:38 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Thacker

78132

Consent-Based Siting

From: Brett Tharp [mailto:bh_tharp@att.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:27 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Brett Tharp

78757

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jeffrey Thomas [<mailto:jeffrey.thomas.1@att.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:22 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jeffrey Thomas

75215

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paul Thomas [<mailto:pjt4email@me.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:53 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paul Thomas

77703

Consent-Based Siting

From: Pam Thomas-Hill [<mailto:pthomas33170@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:08 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pam Thomas-Hill

77045

Consent-Based Siting

From: Candace Thompson [<mailto:freetoecan@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 9:43 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Candace Thompson

76531

Consent-Based Siting

From: Janie Thompson [<mailto:slidnsidwaz@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 6:30 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Janie Thompson

87412

Consent-Based Siting

From: lisa thorne [<mailto:flyingruglady@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:30 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

lisa thorne

78657

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sally Thurman [<mailto:sallythurman@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:56 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sally Thurman

76712

Consent-Based Siting

From: Claudia Tijerina [<mailto:cltijerina@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Claudia Tijerina

78249

Consent-Based Siting

From: Laura Timmis [<mailto:lauratimmis@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:47 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Laura Timmis

78759

Consent-Based Siting

From: Nancy Tipton [<mailto:nancytipton889@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:45 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Nancy Tipton

78624

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ralph Tobin [<mailto:turtlerunning@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:04 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ralph Tobin

76103

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Tomlinson [<mailto:rtomlinson848@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Tomlinson

77546

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Torres [<mailto:dctorres69@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Torres

78228

Consent-Based Siting

From: Matthew Torres [<mailto:matthewdtorres@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:58 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Matthew Torres

78660

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Troiano [<mailto:dtroiano@windstream.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:54 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Troiano

77478

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carol Truitt [<mailto:cjbtruitt@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:51 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carol Truitt

76132

Consent-Based Siting

From: Gordon Turner [mailto:gordonturner_98@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:38 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Gordon Turner

78731

Consent-Based Siting

From: HL Tyler [<mailto:hlyler@animalfirm.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:29 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

HL Tyler

78006

Consent-Based Siting

From: Roopa Upadhyia [<mailto:Superroopa@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:06 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Roopa Upadhy

75025

Consent-Based Siting

From: Irvin Uphoff [<mailto:iauphoff@flash.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:36 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

This is really an irresponsible , incompetent and stupid move. These wastes should be stored at the locations where they were generated. Don't endanger our lives because of corporate stupidity and money.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Irvin Uphoff

75211

Consent-Based Siting

From: Wayne Vale [<mailto:waynevale2@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:41 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Wayne Vale

75067

Consent-Based Siting

From: Adrian F. Van Dellen [<mailto:NatureMate.avd@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:55 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Adrian F. Van Dellen

75979

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paula Vaughan [<mailto:pyvaughan@aim.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:18 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paula Vaughan

78739

Consent-Based Siting

From: Frances Vernon [<mailto:zenarama@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Frances Vernon

76308

Consent-Based Siting

From: Matthew Vigil [<mailto:Matthew.vigil71@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:23 AM

To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Matthew Vigil

75104

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kathleen Voisin [<mailto:ksghosthuntress@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kathleen Voisin

76543

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jimmy Vukovich [<mailto:jimvukovich@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jimmy Vukovich

77024

Consent-Based Siting

From: Ryan W. [<mailto:rywash23@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:15 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Ryan W.

78240

Consent-Based Siting

From: Molly Walker [<mailto:mollyswalker@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Molly Walker

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Beverly Walker [<mailto:peacockwalk@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:44 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Beverly Walker

78639

Consent-Based Siting

From: Larry Walls [<mailto:lwalls182@tx.rr.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:13 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Larry Walls

75075

Consent-Based Siting

From: Margie Walters [mailto:margieh786@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:32 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Margie Walters

79705

Consent-Based Siting

From: christine ward [<mailto:cward76050@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:48 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

christine ward

76050

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mobi Warren [<mailto:mobiwarren@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:02 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mobi Warren

78232

Consent-Based Siting

From: Carrie Watson [<mailto:Hillcountrycarrie@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:58 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Carrie Watson

77340

Consent-Based Siting

From: Judy Webb [mailto:jwebb_mail@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:49 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Judy Webb

75206

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jessica Weber [<mailto:jessi.thornton@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jessica Weber

75023

Consent-Based Siting

From: bill wedeking [<mailto:bill.wedeking@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:21 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

bill wedeking

77025

Consent-Based Siting

From: Barbara Welch [<mailto:obscuredjinn@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 11:26 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Barbara Welch

79922

Consent-Based Siting

From: Eileen Welch [<mailto:Jebwelch@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Eileen Welch

76006

Consent-Based Siting

From: Frances Weller [<mailto:fweller@kw.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Frances Weller

78645

Consent-Based Siting

From: Charlotte Wells [<mailto:Baytime@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Charlotte Wells

77571

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kevin West [mailto:jug@utexas.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:07 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kevin West

78723

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sarah Weynand [<mailto:sweynand@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sarah Weynand

78216

Consent-Based Siting

From: Marley Whistler [<mailto:marleysharp@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marley Whistler

75216

Consent-Based Siting

From: Whitney Whitaker [<mailto:Whitneyyw@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Whitney Whitaker

76039

Consent-Based Siting

From: Charles White [<mailto:charleswhite1955@me.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:00 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Charles White

78201

Consent-Based Siting

From: Kaiba White [<mailto:kaibawhite@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Kaiba White

78741

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lorene Wiatt [<mailto:lwiatt@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:44 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lorene Wiatt

77042

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Wiggins [mailto:ernie.wiggins@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:05 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

We are a big state, but we do not need nuclear waste here in Texas, I oppose this measure.

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Wiggins

75218

Consent-Based Siting

From: Francesca Wigle [<mailto:fwigle@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 1:03 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Francesca Wigle

78759

Consent-Based Siting

From: William Wildfong [<mailto:wildfongster@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:52 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

William Wildfong

78028

Consent-Based Siting

From: Deborah Wiley [<mailto:zivaworks@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:31 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Deborah Wiley

75751

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sandra Wilkerson [<mailto:swilk27@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:46 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sandra Wilkerson

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: David Williams [<mailto:ldwilliams78231@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

David Williams

78231

Consent-Based Siting

From: Glenda Williams [<mailto:gjay55@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:35 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Glenda Williams

77640

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mark Williams [mailto:markandmaxwill@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:36 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mark Williams

76051

Consent-Based Siting

From: James Williams [<mailto:ezz@pdq.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:01 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I absolutely oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states through my community of Houston, Texas, for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to my community would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through my and other local communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site. The transportation of mass quantities of nuclear waste to any where is a terrorist nightmare come true!

The only reason for this proposal is to generate money for the transportation/disposal companies. It makes absolutely no sense in any other context. Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes

must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

James Williams

77004

Consent-Based Siting

From: Terrie Williams [mailto:pit_bull_lovr@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:49 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Terrie Williams

77662

Consent-Based Siting

From: Paul Williamson [<mailto:paw2404@verizon.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:42 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Paul Williamson

75028

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Wilson [<mailto:johnmarwilson@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:18 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Wilson

76638

Consent-Based Siting

From: Thomas Windberg [<mailto:tjwindberg@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:22 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Thomas Windberg

78745

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dallas Windham [<mailto:Medic4059@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:26 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dallas Windham

75243

Consent-Based Siting

From: Lucinda Windsor [<mailto:lucindawindsor@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:42 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lucinda Windsor

76065

Consent-Based Siting

From: Mark Witte [<mailto:witte.m@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mark Witte

75081

Consent-Based Siting

From: Robert Wolpa [<mailto:rob-dan@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:31 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities of risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Robert Wolpa

75233

Consent-Based Siting

From: Esther Womack [<mailto:estherwomack@charter.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:50 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Esther Womack

76049

Consent-Based Siting

From: Christine Wordlaw [mailto:chrisniner_49@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:28 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Christine Wordlaw

75229

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jimmy Wright [<mailto:jd.wright1949@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:24 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jimmy Wright

76248

Consent-Based Siting

From: Guadalupe Yanez [<mailto:lupe.yanez49@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:08 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Guadalupe Yanez

79938

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Yarber [<mailto:johnyarber@att.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:23 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Yarber

78749

Consent-Based Siting

From: Jane Yater [<mailto:jayater@texas.net>]
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 1:11 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jane Yater

78704

Consent-Based Siting

From: charles yeiser [<mailto:drillwizard@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:15 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

charles yeiser

78233

Consent-Based Siting

From: Aaron York [<mailto:Cky3t@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:20 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Aaron York

78218

Consent-Based Siting

From: Sarah Yost [<mailto:sallyost@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:29 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sarah Yost

78217

Consent-Based Siting

From: John Young [<mailto:ForJohnAndBarbara@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:35 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal.

We must shut down our nuclear energy plants now, unfortunately at the same time that we must stop extracting fossil fuels from the earth. This is the price for continuing to deny the realities inherent in nuclear energy and fossil fuel energy (including so called "natural" gas) and of kicking these cans down the road rather than shutting them down long ago.

The planned shut downs must happen first and now so that we can then turn fully to the full realities and problem of permanent nuclear waste disposal. As long as production continues, fantasies and make believe and pretend obscure the realities of the tasks confronting us.

It is unacceptable that none of the eight "consent-based siting" Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation's high-level radioactive waste.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won't know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about.

The Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

The possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site has not been adequately addressed.

Thank you for considering my comments.

John Young

78586

Consent-Based Siting

From: Cheryl Young [<mailto:cher7007@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:59 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Cheryl Young

75212

Consent-Based Siting

From: Dolores Young [<mailto:dolourosa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:01 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Dolores Young

75076

Consent-Based Siting

From: Stephen Yuen [<mailto:stephenmyuen@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:35 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Stephen Yuen

77498

Consent-Based Siting

From: janie zackin [<mailto:jrzackin@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:58 PM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

janie zackin

78756

Consent-Based Siting

From: Piero Zoro [<mailto:astarkas@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:01 AM
To: Consent Based Siting <consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov>
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Piero Zoro

77088