

## 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:harold_albers@hotmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:25 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:Gen_ali@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:39 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:heksabbath@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:19 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:lacuidadanadelmundo@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 12:07 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 Armintor

76209

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Lisa Arriaga [<mailto:lesalon4@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:11 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

Dave Bardnell

79912

## Consent-Based Siting

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 Barelló

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:robertbohmfolk@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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

Malaika Boyd

78660

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: D J Boykin [[mailto:dru\\_rt92@twc.com](mailto:dru_rt92@twc.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:38 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:dm\\_rt92@msn.com](mailto:dm_rt92@msn.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:39 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 & 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:sapphire_4575@yahoo.com)] Sent:  
Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:09 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:Bushjulie92@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:11 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

Julie Bush

78414

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Raul Bustillo [<mailto:00712@sbccglobal.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:29 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

Russ Champiny

75070

## Consent-Based Siting

---

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

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

Lucinda Channon

76123



## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Stephanie Chapman [[mailto:Latina\\_chick316@hotmail.com](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 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:susan_jack@juno.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:39 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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@shcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:58 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:chibo_viejo@sbcglobal.net)]  
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 11:17 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:jackeecox@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:22 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:analisa_duran@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:44 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:freespirt_41@hotmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:09 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

Anne del Prado

77541

## Consent-Based Siting

---

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

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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: Rachelle Denton-Taylor [<mailto:Radt87@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:14 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

Nancy Durr

78336

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Barbara Eckert [<mailto:beckert@shcgloba.net>]  
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 9:22 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:evans_carleen@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:13 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 Fox

76574

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Linda Frankel [<mailto:lfp80@sbcbglobal.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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:Sangeetha_gali@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:34 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

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

Jorge I. Gomez

78258

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Jean Gonzales [[mailto:jhnj\\_serv@yahoo.com](mailto:jhnj_serv@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 8:46 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 Gonzalez

78723

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Cathy Gordon [<mailto:cgorwriter@sbccglobal.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:46 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Lavina Gorman

78382

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Elva Granado [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 Granado

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:Terence_griffin@shcglobal.net)]

Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:22 PM

To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:51 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Connie Habern

77006

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Rolf Habersang [<mailto:rhhabersang@aahsllp.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:21 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:mary_0926@hotmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:38 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

DORIS HINES

75038



## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Beverly Hoff [<mailto:hash16803@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:33 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:sandyannn@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:31 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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: Randee Hughes [<mailto:rhrh0000@hotmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:54 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 Kettermann [<mailto:Kingpig444@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:21 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 Kettermann

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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](mailto: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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes

must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:g_kirkpatrick@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:33 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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



## 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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:viel@sbcbglobal.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:43 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 Lancot

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:Sintxdenis@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:30 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:ken_kc_959@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:49 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:chauncey_945@outlook.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:43 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:julios_1994@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:50 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:doug_marick@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:02 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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@sbcbglobal.net>]  
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 12:28 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:tillypat_mccain@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:54 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:mcmehd@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:41 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Jesus Mercado

77060

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Susan Metcalfe [mailto:[smetcalfe4911@sbcglobal.net](mailto:smetcalfe4911@sbcglobal.net)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 11:34 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:ari_meyer@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:36 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Brian Miller

78757

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Jane Miller [[mailto:jsmiller\\_miller0@gmail.com](mailto:jsmiller_miller0@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:46 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 Moczygemba [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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:Lucy_pedregon_molinar@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:29 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

J J Moran

77401

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Rashida Morgan [<mailto:negrita1642@hotmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:40 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 O'Dear [<mailto:ekodear@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:25 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won't know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation's high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn't one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Harry Ogg

79701

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: George Ohlendorf [[mailto:george\\_ohlendorf@msn.com](mailto:george_ohlendorf@msn.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:16 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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

## 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:dovertont19@verizon.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:28 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:LPagan210@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:14 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>

Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:craig_parker@att.net)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:24 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 Pedersen

78148

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Clara Pelaez [[mailto:Claritape\\_80@yahoo.com](mailto:Claritape_80@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:46 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rebecc 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 Perry

75708



## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Ruthanne Peterson [[mailto:Peterson\\_ruthanne@gmail.com](mailto:Peterson_ruthanne@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:43 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Ray Reece

78704

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: curtis reh fuss [<mailto:c302@suddenlink.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:10 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

curtis reh fuss

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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 Riffin

79106

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Jeff Rister [[mailto:Jeffrist\\_1999@yahoo.com](mailto:Jeffrist_1999@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:00 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Colleen SAUNDERS

76001

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Dorothy Schleicher [[mailto:Dorothy\\_Schleicher@baylor.edu](mailto:Dorothy_Schleicher@baylor.edu)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:00 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:zog_hasfallen@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 3:33 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

Dario Sifuentes

75080

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Cathy Simmons [mailto:mllecathy@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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:slsmatana@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:12wcsmith@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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:tangel@live.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:31 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:randy_southers@hotmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:50 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy will step back from this process and reconsider prioritizing long-term solutions that will minimize risk for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Karoyln 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 Thacker

78132

## Consent-Based Siting

---

From: Brett Tharp [[mailto:bh\\_tharp@att.net](mailto:bh_tharp@att.net)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 7:27 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:dtorres69@sbcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:20 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:gordonturner_98@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 6:38 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 Upadhyaya [<mailto:Superroopa@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:06 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:jwebb_mail@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:49 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:marleysharpe@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 5:24 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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:lwiaatt@att.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 9:44 AM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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 at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn't even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities. Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto: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](mailto:pit_bull_lovr@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:49 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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@shcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 1:31 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:chrisniner_49@yahoo.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 8:28 PM  
To: Consent Based Siting <[consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of 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.

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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.



Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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](mailto:consentbasedsiting@hq.doe.gov)>  
Subject: Consent-based siting public comment from Texas

I oppose shipping high level radioactive waste from other states to Texas for storage or disposal. The health and safety risks to our communities would be too great – both from the transportation of this waste through our communities and from the possible contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer near the disposal site.

Instead of putting thousands of communities at risk to ship highly radioactive material around the country to be “temporarily” stored, the Department of Energy should find a permanent disposal site that will offer the lowest possible risk of contamination. Until that time, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has previously said that the least risky option is to keep the waste stored securely at or close to the site where it was generated, and most reactor sites are already licensed to do that.

Without a plan to end the production of high level radioactive waste or a known long-term storage location, no community – in Texas or elsewhere – can truly give informed consent to accept this waste. People won’t know how much waste will be transported through their communities, how much will be buried at the storage location or whether it will ever end up being moved.

Despite claims that no site has been selected, it has been clear since 2012 that the Texas/ New Mexico region is being targeted. Any “consent” discussions must keep this consideration in mind. It is unacceptable that none of the eight “consent-based siting” Department of Energy meetings held around the country were in Texas or New Mexico, the states being targeted for storing the nation’s high-level radioactive waste. Those most likely to be impacted had no opportunity to participate. Rules developed based on feedback collected at those meetings are likely to be unfair because those given feedback would know that their state wasn’t one of the possible locations.

The consent- based siting process should be responsive and tailored to those who would be impacted by siting. In Texas, we believe that consent must come directly from all those people who could be impacted. This would require elections in the communities surrounding the proposed disposal location, those communities that would have highly radioactive waste shipments passing through them, and those whose water supplies could be at risk of contamination. The use of funds from the applicant, contractors, shippers, utilities, or other interests that could benefit financially to influence the election should be prohibited.

Texas has been portrayed as wanting radioactive waste storage, based on a vote by Commissioners in Andrews County, Texas. But there was no real public debate, or broad discussion, just a routine vote that most people didn’t even know about. Commissioners may have been swayed by potential increases in county revenues, but many local people are opposed to having high-level radioactive waste stored in Andrews County. Those people and all those who could be impacted in other communities should have a chance to vote.

True consent can only come after all relevant facts have been fully disclosed and discussed. Transportation routes must be identified as part of any proposal to give all impacted communities the opportunity to become educated on the risks and decide whether or not to give their consent. An Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal/storage site must be completed and the possible impacts widely shared with the surrounding communities.

Despite the fact that an active Nuclear Regulatory Commission license application is being reviewed for a site in Texas, a huge amount of information is lacking, including transportation routes and an Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope that the Department of Energy 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