

1/20/03

68FR66130

(4)

RECEIVED

2004 JAN 15 AM 9:04

To the NRC:

Rules and Directives

Branch

USNRC

I submitted a statement at the public hearing that you held in Clinton, IL on Dec 18, 2003 on the question of turning on a second reactor on the Clinton site. I want to extend that statement a little bit.

I wrote that I had seen anger in young people's eyes as they realized what is being done to them and their world. That is true but there is more. I have also seen confusion, hurt and fear in their eyes as well. They don't understand why one generation would do that to another.

And in your booklet Citizen's Guide to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission Information I found two disturbing quotes on page seven.

The first, in the section on high-level waste states "The disposal of high-level radioactive waste requires a determination of acceptable health and environmental impacts over thousands of years." Who gave you the right to determine what is "acceptable" harm to inflict on the future? If we can't create something without harming the future, we shouldn't create it at all.

F-17DS = ADM-03
Call = J. Kenyon (75K2)

Template ADM-013

The second, in the section on Decommissioning states "Some facilities require more complex decommissioning activities for timely cleanup of unusual and difficult sites, particularly those with a great deal of soil contamination or with old contaminated buildings."

So in your own literature you have to acknowledge that nuclear power is not as safe and clean as you otherwise present it to be. Why are these sites "unusual and difficult"? Why the "great deal of soil contamination"?

The public has a right to straight answers to these questions.

I enclose a copy of my letter to the editor of the Pantagraph published on January 4. It was my small attempt to let the public know that this was our chance to be heard on this issue. You, of course, did next to nothing to let the public know about this.

When I called your toll-free number I asked the woman who answered if the NRC was on the public's side in this and she answered "no". I said that as a government agency, surely it was your

responsibility to serve the public's interest.
She said the agency was on no one's side
and only dealt in "facts". She said it was
only a matter of semantics.

I answered back that I wished that
was all it was.

But I fear its not.

For the future

Gregg Brown
303 E Locust #2
Bloomington, IL 61701

Jan. 4, 2004

Your Views

Let NRC know you want no part of Strontium-90

There are those moments when history can turn. This may be one of those moments.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is taking public comments regarding the Early Site Permit for a second nuclear reactor at the Clinton facility.

The NRC staff will assure consideration of comments mailed by Jan. 9.

What is at stake here?

The Radiation and Public Health Project has found a 60 percent rise in radioactive isotope Strontium-90 in our babies' teeth since the late 1980s, with the counties closest to nuclear reactors having the highest levels.

It is important to understand that Strontium-90 doesn't occur in nature. It is produced by the fission of either nuclear bombs or nuclear power plants.

It is also important to understand that it doesn't take an accident for a nuclear power plant to release radioactive material. That material is released during the routine operation of those facilities.

RPHP has found significant elevations in the infant mortality rates of counties downwind of the Clinton facility during the years the plant is operating and reductions of that rate when the plant is shut down. That data has been previously published in The Pantagraph.

Our babies' bodies weren't meant to hold Strontium-90. That was not part of the creator's plan.

The NRC must hear from us. Tell them you don't want Strontium-90 in our children's bodies. Tell them that is too high a price to pay for our lifestyle.

The Environmental Law and Policy Center has developed a plan called "Repowering the Midwest: the Clean Energy Development Plan for the Heartland." That plan reduces our use of nuclear power while creating more jobs and making/saving more money than building more nuclear reactors would.

Ask the NRC to seriously consider that plan.

Send your comments to: Chief, Rules and Directives Branch; Division of Administrative Services; Office of Administration;

Mailstop T-6D 59; U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Washington, D.C. 20555-001.

Or e-mail them at ClintonEIS@nrc.gov or call them toll free at 1-800-368-5642, ext. 1180.

Gregg Brown
Bloomington

LETTER GUIDELINES

The Pantagraph welcomes letters commenting on current public issues.

All letters are subject to editing and can be no more than 350 words. No more than one letter from the same person will be printed within 30 days.

Only an original to The Pantagraph with the writer's name and complete home address will be accepted. We do not open e-mail attachments.

A daytime telephone number is required for verification.

Send to:

The Pantagraph

Letters to the Editor

P.O. Box 2907

Bloomington, IL 61702-2907

Fax number: (309) 829-7000

E-mail: bwills@pantagraph.com