

Becky Denney
625 Angenette Ave
Kirkwood, MO 63122-6220

66 FR 39893
8/1/01 (4)

RECEIVED

August 23, 2001

RE: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

2001 AUG 28 AM 8:55

Mr. Michael T. Lesar, Chief (MS-T6-D59)
Rules and Directives Branch-Admin. Services
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives
Branch
USNRC

Dear Sir:

I request a full Environmental Impact Statement because I believe the public as well as any employees of the plant need to know as much as possible about the operation and results of using nuclear reactors for research. For instance, it is said that the graphite that surrounds the beryllium shield could burn and once burning may be very hard to extinguish. Is this true? Is this shield similar to the one at the Chernobyl plant?

Since the low-level waste disposal facility in South Carolina will be closed to MURR for disposing wastes, we won't have a place for them. We don't want them stored in Missouri. Neither do we want nuclear wastes transported across our highways, on our railroads, or through our cities. The state of Nevada does not want nuclear waste stored there. There is an article from the NY Times on August 11, 2001 "Governor Threatens to Bar U.S. Plutonium Shipments." While this pertains to the waste from Savannah, this is typical of the attitude of state officials. And, in this case it appears state officials from both parties agree that South Carolina will not allow waste to come into the state and remain there.

We don't have a permanent disposal facility for radioactive waste. This lethal material will be actively deadly even past the 10,000-years that Congress is planning for. We, human beings, don't have a place to put it and can't ensure that any containers will hold it for that time. We also can't ensure, that if containers do hold it, any humans will know what is stored in the containers. We don't know if people will be able to read our signs or messages thousands of years from now. So they won't know what dangers our wastes hold for them. We are truly irresponsible.

I oppose a license extension for the MU Research Reactor in particular because it uses a highly enriched uranium while other reactors use a lower percentage of enriched uranium. I believe this puts the plant at risk for greater dangers and especially for sabotage. This is an old reactor where accidents are likely to occur. Evidently the plant has trouble finding qualified employees and this increases the chances for an accident.

The citizens of Missouri must pay the bill for this reactor now and in case of accidents and widespread contamination. We can't afford this kind of tax burden.

Sincerely,

Becky Denney

Becky Denney
625 Angenette Ave
Kirkwood, MO 63122

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = A. ADAMS (AXA)

Template = ADM-013