

From: <Kamlon2911@aol.com>
To: <teh@nrc.gov>
Date: 9/30/02 3:06PM
Subject: MOX Facility



Mr. Mike Lesar, Chief U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Rules & Directives
Branch Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration:

RECEIVED
2002 OCT 15 PM 1:55
Rules and Directives
Branch
USNRC

I attended the MOX Environmental Review Meeting in Savannah, Georgia on September 18, 2002. I have read the material on the MOX facility and on the shipping of the fuel pellets.

At the very least, I am opposed to the MOX facility being constructed at the Savannah River Site. I feel that the fuel should be made at the sites where it will be used and that the spent fuel should be stored at those sites. If that cannot be done, then the fuel should not be made.

On safety grounds, in view of possible terrorist attacks, I feel that any nuclear facility is a serious risk to the surrounding area. The Savannah River Site already is a target. Any further activity just paints the bull's eye bigger. The terrorist organizations with whom we have to deal in this day and age have shown, and continue to show, that they are ready, willing and able to die to accomplish their objectives. With a concerted effort to eliminate these terrorist groups, they may seem to fade away. The MOX Facility would be in operation for years to come. An undercover terrorist cell would have the time to come up with a devastating plan that could release the radiation. Depending on the wind conditions, the radiation could spread so far and so fast that a lot of the east coast population could receive dangerous doses. And if the wind happens to blow from the east (as it does occasionally), the Atlanta metropolitan area would be affected. If the radiation is not soon fatal, parents will be left to wonder whether they will live to see their children grow up and much worse they may have to watch their children sicken and perhaps die. Further generations may be put at risk from genetic anomalies caused by radiation contamination.

I am opposed to the enhancement of the radioactivity of the plutonium which thereby increases the length of time for which this material will remain dangerous to the environment. I am in favor of storing it as safely as possible in a way in which the radioactivity decreases as rapidly as possible. Yes, a few fewer thousand years may make a difference. The short term commercial advantage does not compensate for possible long term problems with transportation and storage. Let's not do something which seems to be expedient, only to find out that there was a safer way in which to accomplish it.

Sincerely,
Katherine Russell
409 Sand Hill Road, Savannah GA

ERIDS = ADM-03

Template = ADM-013