From: "Beverly Cohen" <jamattona@aol.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 1:01 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Beverly Cohen
1243 W 16th St
San Pedro, CA 90731

3/10/05

70FR 12022

(37)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

May 26, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SESP Review Complete

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template= ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Beverly Cohen

Mail Envelope Properties (429600D1.5F1 : 12 : 1521)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 1:00 PM
From: "Beverly Cohen" <jamattona@aol.com>

Created By: jamattona@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5241	Thursday, May 26, 2005 1:00 PM
Mime.822	6295	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Will Yeager" <gardenbeekeeper@yahoo.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 1:40 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Will Yeager
1407 Venice Blvd,
Venice, CA 90291

3/10/04
70FR 10022
38

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

May 26, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template- ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Will Yeager

Mail Envelope Properties (429609F5.AD1 : 10 : 2769)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 1:39 PM
From: "Will Yeager" <gardenbeekeeper@yahoo.com>

Created By: gardenbeekeeper@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5237	Thursday, May 26, 2005 1:39 PM
Mime.822	6298	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Paul Stein" <pls47@hotmial.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 10:31 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Paul Stein
532 LaGuardia pl #224
NY, NY 10012

3/10/05
70FR12022
(39)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

RDB Received

May 26, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Paul Stein

Mail Envelope Properties (4295DD94.168 : 5 : 61800)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 10:30 AM
From: "Paul Stein" <pls47@hotmial.com>

Created By: pls47@hotmial.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5235	Thursday, May 26, 2005 10:30 AM
Mime.822	6288	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "D.A. Wagner" <dw38@drexel.edu>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 8:36 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

D.A. Wagner
109 Fairview Dr.
Lansdale, Pa 19446

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(40)

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

May 26, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

D.A. Wagner

Mail Envelope Properties (4295C2BF.364 : 17 : 58212)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 8:36 AM
From: "D.A. Wagner" <dw38@drexel.edu>

Created By: dw38@drexel.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5238	Thursday, May 26, 2005 8:36 AM
Mime.822	6287	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: George Gore <geo_gore@yahoo.com>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 12:56 AM
Subject: Comments on Draft EIS (report # NUREG-1815)

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(41)
ADM Receive
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

From: George Gore, 702 W Washington St, Urbana, IL 61801
To: Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, US NRC
Subj: Comments on Draft EIS (report # NUREG-1815)
Date: 25 May 2005

Please include these comments in the public record:

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Sandra Steingraber recently spoke in Champaign/Urbana about the Illiopolis PVC plant explosion last year. Turns out when the plant exploded, power was lost, which shut off the water pumps, so fighting a major fire became extremely difficult. In addition, the emergency warning sirens also didn't work since there wasn't any backup power. The winds shifted several times, blowing a toxic cloud of dioxin in multiple directions. There were also rains that pulled the toxins down to surrounding lands and homes. A nuclear accident or attack would be similar, but the consequences would be even more devastating.

The recent National Academy of Science report on nuclear fuel pool storage hazards found the storage pools at the Dresdan and Lasalle plants (downwind of Chicago) are particularly vulnerable, meaning a radioactive fire with blowing smoke are realistic risks: http://www.nap.edu/books/0309096472/html

New York has already been attacked, Los Angeles may be next, but Chicago is the third largest city with vulnerable fuel rod storage nearby. Both Chicago and nuclear facilities were discovered to be terrorist targets. National attention is already highly focused on nuclear issues with Iran and North Korea, as well as dirty bombs.

One major accident or attack anywhere in the world will derail nuclear for another two decades, if not longer. More importantly, public pressure to immediately shut down power plants would be very strong and possibly undeniable, resulting in a huge economic impact from the sudden loss of electricity. Diversification away from nuclear is critical, especially in Illinois where 50 percent is nuclear.

If we end government subsidies, including reactor insurance the market refuses to bear, and create a level playing field for investors, then decentralized energy efficiency and renewable energy can readily compete and save taxpayers a lot of money.

We need to face up to the reality that nuclear power plants are not safe in an age of terrorism.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)

Dividing the project into multiple parts (Early Site Permit, Construction and Operating License, and Site Safety Analysis Report) to limit the scope of each part and telling the public that comments on

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

environmental impacts of safety or operation are not being considered for this EIS is arbitrary and capricious.

NEPA requires a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the entire project on the local environment and this Draft EIS was only intended for a nuclear reactor (based on the application and NRC's lead), so the comprehensive impacts of an operating nuclear reactor must be considered.

The plant parameter envelope (section 1.1.1) is another example of trying to limit the scope of the entire project to a vague set of parameters for the reactor and claiming the environmental impacts of higher water use to remove wasted heat energy can't be considered. Yet, higher water use may require raising the height of the dam, flooding a bigger area, which is definately a significant environmental impact of the project.

Site preparation (section 1.1.2) refers to 10 CFR 50.10(e)(1), which says activities permitted under an ESP include part (v): "the construction of structures, systems and components which do not prevent

or mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents that could cause undue risk to the health and safety of the public." The last part of the sentance was left out of the draft EIS. This carefully worded NRC code would allow construction of the entire reactor, so long as nothing radioactive is installed.

This allows a huge initial investment into the plant, creating a potentially very costly white elephant if the final construction and operating license were not approved. Approving the ESP approves a new nuclear reactor that will be under tremendous pressure to start operating so it can repay investors for the portion not subsidized by government.

The purpose and need for the proposed action (section 1.3) does not address why we need more nuclear power.

In section 1.4, NRC falsely claims that NEPA does not require a detailed statement about alternatives to the proposed action. The application is to build a nuclear reactor on this site, so reasonably foreseeable future actions and alternatives must be considered. Furthermore, alternative sites in other states were not considered.

Section 2.2 defines the region as within 50 miles without any justification, making it appear arbitrary and capricious, especially since the major cities of Springfield and Peoria are not fully within the boundry, resulting in those cities not being included in the draft EIS for impact analysis.

Section 2.2.1 defines the vicinity as 6 miles without any justification, making it appear arbitrary and capricious, especially since several species are evaluated at 10 mile ranges (end of section 2.7.11 and others). If 10 miles is proper to evaluate endangered or threatened species, it should also be used for every other evaluation, especially those affecting humans. A 10 mile vicinity would certainly include all of Clinton and perhaps Farmer City, whereas a 6 mile

vicinity does not.

At the end of this section geological information references Exelon 2003a to claim there are no known significant mineral resources. This should reference a Geological Survey report and define "significant" as economically viable for extraction.

Section 2.2.3 ends with the Governor's "Opportunity Returns" goals that specify "investing in renewable energy and the environment." There's a limited supply of uranium, which is expected to run out in a few decades, so nuclear power is clearly not renewable.

Another Governor goal is "encouraging investment and opening markets." Nuclear power in an age of terrorism is far too expensive to encourage investment without huge taxpayer subsidies. Otherwise, no rational investor would put money into nuclear power, just as the experts of risk management, insurance companies, would not fully insure nuclear power plants.

Another Governor goal is "investing in entreprenuership and innovation." New products for energy efficiency would accomplish this goal at significantly less cost and the Governor recently proposed at standard of improving statewide efficiency 25 percent. Some energy experts believe 50 percent savings are possible from energy efficiency alone, eliminating the need for any nuclear reactors in Illinois and providing us with a far more affordable, efficient, and sustainable economy. These cost savings would allow us to meet the Governor's other two
goals of improving transportation and education/job training.

At the public hearing, we were told that the comparison of alternatives to nuclear at Exelon's ESP was based on the present situation. Yet, a nuclear reactor isn't expected to operate earlier than 2014, possibly later, making the rationale arbitrary. The comparison should be based on when the alternative is both realistic and most cost effective.

Detailed tables that project both megawatt potential and future costs are needed for the proposed nuclear plant and for alternatives including biofuels, biomass, biogas, mechancial solar, methane hydrates, micro water turbines, natural gas pipeline from Alaska, energy efficienct products and appliances, insulation, wind power, ground source energy, combined heat and power, micro CHP by Honda & Toyota, solar metal alloys, coal gasification, fuel cells, time-based metering, DSM, wave/tide turbines, more accurate or higher mileage standards and hybrid vehicles freeing energy for electricity generation, and higher energy prices decreasing consumption and improving efficiency.

Section 8.2.1.1 says NRC reviewed Exelon's assumptions and analysis to reach a conclusion without sharing any of those same numbers or data in the EIS to allow the public to reach its own conclusions.

Section 8.2.3.1 fails to mention that Illinois could easily get 15 percent of its energy from wind, which is much more scalable than nuclear. Wind is base load energy because once it's operating the fuel is free, so it's always used first.

Section 8.2.3.2 fails to address ground-source heat pumps or earth tubes that extract free energy from the earth to heat/cool homes at a tiny fraction of the cost of using electricity or burning fossil fuels.

8.2.3.10 fails to provide each alternative with estimated megawatts of production or savings, along with costs of each compared to nuclear. The Governor proposed 3,000MW of wind because it's realistic, so only using 60 MW is unfairly arbitrary.

In section 10.3, it says "The benefit is the production of electricity." This fails to address why we even need more energy.

NEPA requires a detailed statement on "the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity." Productivity is the key word for energy because we want to maximize the amount of energy we squeeze out of every source to save money. Conservation is always the cheapest, followed by energy efficiency, then producing electricity, where wind has become very cost effective.

CC: Dave Kraft <neis@neis.org>

Mail Envelope Properties (429556F6.645 : 12 : 50757)

Subject: Comments on Draft EIS (report # NUREG-1815)
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 12:56 AM
From: George Gore <geo_gore@yahoo.com>

Created By: geo_gore@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

neis.org
neis CC (Dave Kraft)

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov
	neis.org

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	9459	Thursday, May 26, 2005 12:56 AM
Mime.822	10778	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: Joyce Blumenshine <joblumen@yahoo.com>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 12:56 AM
Subject: Comments regarding the Exelon Clinton Reactor/Early Site Permit

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(42)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

RDB received

Nanette Gilles
Clinton Site Safety Project Manager
New Reactor Licensing Project Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Thomas Kenyon
Clinton Environmental Project Manager
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Ms. Gilles and Mr. Kenyon:

This letter is to state my concerns regarding the proposed new nuclear reactor at Clinton, Illinois, and to ask the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to deny the Early Site Permit Application requested by Exelon Corporation. I have several major site concerns with this project and believe that granting an Early Site Permit is not appropriate.

1) Concern for area water resources:
I question the impact of a second nuclear reactor on local water resources and the long-term water needs of the community of Clinton. I question the impact of a second reactor releasing water into Clinton Lake, and the impact on the health of the lake.

2) Concern for storage of nuclear waste at the Exelon Clinton plant site:
I question the nuclear waste storage at the site and the adequacy of the nuclear waste storage. I question the stockpiling of nuclear waste in the heartland of America, where prime agricultural lands grow part of our nation's food supply. Central Illinois can be subject to earthquakes, and I urge that the people and agricultural lands of central Illinois not be put at additional risk from nuclear contamination by the construction of a second nuclear reactor.

3) Concern for economic viability of the reactor:
I am concerned about the economics of this plant and costs that would occur to the public for decommissioning, dealing with a terrorist attack, or being burdened with future rate hikes to pay for this plant. Illinois has other energy options and is moving

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

toward a renewable energy portfolio. The power generated from this plant will most likely be sent to states outside of Illinois, and it is not appropriate to inflict the residents of central Illinois with the attending risks and hazards of another nuclear reactor.

I am opposed to the construction of a new nuclear reactor at Clinton, Illinois. Illinois is making progress toward sustainable and renewable energy sources and a new nuclear reactor is in total conflict with the direction of clean and non-hazardous energy sources for the future of Illinois. It is not appropriate to inflict the residents of central Illinois with the attending risks and hazards of another nuclear reactor. Renewable and sustainable energy sources, energy efficiency, and energy conservation should be the focus of America's energy future, and not additional nuclear power. The hazards, risks and costs to American taxpayers for nuclear power are too great for consideration of a new nuclear reactor at Clinton, Illinois.

Sincerely,
Joyce Blumenshine
Conservation Chair
Illinois Chapter Sierra Club
2419 E. Reservoir
Peoria, IL 61614-8029

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Small Business - Try our new Resources site
http://smallbusiness.yahoo.com/resources/

CC: <joblumen@yahoo.com>

Mail Envelope Properties (429556F6.644 : 11 : 50756)

Subject: Comments regarding the Exelon Clinton Reactor/Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 12:55 AM
From: Joyce Blumenshine <joblumen@yahoo.com>

Created By: joblumen@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	3135	Thursday, May 26, 2005 12:55 AM
Mime.822	4343	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "David Turnoy" <turnoy1@comcast.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 12:49 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

David Turnoy
811 Wendy Court
West Linn, OR 97068

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(43)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

May 26, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

David Turnoy

Mail Envelope Properties (42955567.5F9 : 11 : 50681)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 12:49 AM
From: "David Turnoy" <turnoy1@comcast.net>

Created By: turnoy1@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5240	Thursday, May 26, 2005 12:49 AM
Mime.822	6295	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: Craig Pohlod <craigspohlod@yahoo.com>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 12:00 AM
Subject: Exelon Early Site Permit (draft EIS)

3/10/05
70FR12022
(44)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

KDB response

To whom It May Concern:

The following comments are a compilation of my written and verbal statements offered at the Clinton Public Meeting held on the 19th of April at Clinton Junior High School and sponsored by the USNRC.

First, I'd like to say that I, as well as many others in the audience here tonight, do not consider the USNRC to be the bad guys in this process. The USNRC isn't perfect, but most people here tonight recognize that the USNRC is professional, competent, and its actions are in good faith.

I am pleased to speak in favor of approval of the Draft EIS as part of the ESP for the Clinton Power Station (CPS). I was involved with public information efforts associated with permits and licensing of CPS Unit #1.

I came to this area in 1974, out of the US Navy to pursue a degree in Nuclear Engineering. Like many of my contemporaries from the US Navy, I was appalled by the low level of the public's knowledge about nuclear power. Thirty years ago very few people spoke in favor of building the CPS.

It is very gratifying to see so many people speak in favor of taking this important first step in energizing nuclear construction. It is particularly encouraging to see so many students here to night. To them, I say "Keep up the good work". The public is hungry to learn about nuclear issues.

I know that the Commission is very knowledgeable about these issues and those that the people who speak against approval of the Draft EIS and the ESP raise. But some of what I have heard and read here tonight compels me to offer some corrections.

One of the anti-nuclear groups is handing out a pamphlet that claims high level reactor waste will be turned into consumer products for distribution for home use. This is outrageous and unbelievable. It sounds like the claims made during the hearings about the siting of a low level waste desposal site, claiming that Commonwealth Edison would fill it with spent fuel as soon as the site was opened.

A grandmother condemned the fission process as being manmade and therefore evil, especially since it produces plutonium. This claim is refuted by the evidence found at the Oklo natural reactor sites discovered in the Republic of Gabon in Africa.

One woman appealed to the USNRC to abandon the letter of the law and embrace her interpretation of the spirit of the law. Her example of this was to cite Christ healing on the Sabbath. She then claimed he did this 3,000 years ago.

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

The question of nuclear liability was so distorted, I hardly recognized the Price Anderson Act as it was presented.

It is also sad that I did not hear a new idea about assuring a reliable source of electricity. The people who spoke against approval of the draft EIS seemed to have visions and agendas which places decision making less accessible than it is already. It also places it in their hands as they seem to think that they know better than anyone else the direction society should take.

Thirty years ago solar energy was the alternative of choice. Wind power seems to have replaced it without serious analysis.

I'll close by showing my favorite ANS tee shirt which has "know nukes" on the back.

Craig S. Pohlod
PO Box 252
Thomasboro Ill 61878

1-217-643-6605 home
1-217-278-7561 work

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Small Business - Try our new Resources site
http://smallbusiness.yahoo.com/resources/

Mail Envelope Properties (429549BB.221 : 2 : 49697)

Subject: Exelon Early Site Permit (draft EIS)
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 11:59 PM
From: Craig Pohlod <craigspohlod@yahoo.com>

Created By: craigspohlod@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3472	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 11:59 PM
Mime.822	4640	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: George Gore <geo_gore@yahoo.com>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 11:59 PM
Subject: Comments on Draft EIS (report # NUREG-1815)

3/10/05
70 FR 12022

45

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:03

From: George Gore, 702 W Washington St, Urbana, IL 61801
To: Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, US NRC
Subj: Comments on Draft EIS (report # NUREG-1815)
Date: 25 May 2005

Please include these comments in the public record:

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Sandra Steingraber recently spoke in Champaign/Urbana about the Illiopolis PVC plant explosion last year. Turns out when the plant exploded, power was lost, which shut off the water pumps, so fighting a major fire became extremely difficult. In addition, the emergency warning sirens also didn't work since there wasn't any backup power. The winds shifted several times, blowing a toxic cloud of dioxin in multiple directions. There were also rains that pulled the toxins down to surrounding lands and homes. A nuclear accident or attack would be similar, but the consequences would be even more devastating.

The recent National Academy of Science report on nuclear fuel pool storage hazards found the storage pools at the Dresdan and Lasalle plants (downwind of Chicago) are particularly vulnerable, meaning a radioactive fire with blowing smoke are realistic risks: http://www.nap.edu/books/0309096472/html

New York has already been attacked, Los Angeles may be next, but Chicago is the third largest city with vulnerable fuel rod storage nearby. Both Chicago and nuclear facilities were discovered to be terrorist targets. National attention is already highly focused on nuclear issues with Iran and North Korea, as well as dirty bombs.

One major accident or attack anywhere in the world will derail nuclear for another two decades, if not longer. More importantly, public pressure to immediately shut down power plants would be very strong and possibly undeniable, resulting in a huge economic impact from the sudden loss of electricity. Diversification away from nuclear is critical, especially in Illinois where 50 percent is nuclear.

If we end government subsidies, including reactor insurance the market refuses to bear, and create a level playing field for investors, then decentralized energy efficiency and renewable energy can readily compete and save taxpayers a lot of money.

We need to face up to the reality that nuclear power plants are not safe in an age of terrorism.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)

Dividing the project into multiple parts (Early Site Permit, Construction and Operating License, and Site Safety Analysis Report) to limit the scope of each part and telling the public that comments on

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RFDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

environmental impacts of safety or operation are not being considered for this EIS is arbitrary and capricious.

NEPA requires a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the entire project on the local environment and this Draft EIS was only intended for a nuclear reactor (based on the application and NRC's lead), so the comprehensive impacts of an operating nuclear reactor must be considered.

The plant parameter envelope (section 1.1.1) is another example of trying to limit the scope of the entire project to a vague set of parameters for the reactor and claiming the environmental impacts of higher water use to remove wasted heat energy can't be considered. Yet, higher water use may require raising the height of the dam, flooding a bigger area, which is definately a significant environmental impact of the project.

Site preparation (section 1.1.2) refers to 10 CFR 50.10(e)(1), which says activities permitted under an ESP include part (v): "the construction of structures, systems and components which do not prevent

or mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents that could cause undue risk to the health and safety of the public." The last part of the sentance was left out of the draft EIS. This carefully worded NRC code would allow construction of the entire reactor, so long as nothing radioactive is installed.

This allows a huge initial investment into the plant, creating a potentially very costly white elephant if the final construction and operating license were not approved. Approving the ESP approves a new nuclear reactor that will be under tremendous pressure to start operating so it can repay investors for the portion not subsidized by government.

The purpose and need for the proposed action (section 1.3) does not address why we need more nuclear power.

In section 1.4, NRC falsely claims that NEPA does not require a detailed statement about alternatives to the proposed action. The application is to build a nuclear reactor on this site, so reasonably foreseeable future actions and alternatives must be considered. Furthermore, alternative sites in other states were not considered.

Section 2.2 defines the region as within 50 miles without any justification, making it appear arbitrary and capricious, especially since the major cities of Springfield and Peoria are not fully within the boundry, resulting in those cities not being included in the draft EIS for impact analysis.

Section 2.2.1 defines the vicinity as 6 miles without any justification, making it appear arbitrary and capricious, especially since several species are evaluated at 10 mile ranges (end of section 2.7.11 and others). If 10 miles is proper to evaluate endangered or threatened species, it should also be used for every other evaluation, especially those affecting humans. A 10 mile vicinity would certainly include all of Clinton and perhaps Farmer City, whereas a 6 mile

vicinity does not.

At the end of this section geological information references Exelon 2003a to claim there are no known significant mineral resources. This should reference a Geological Survey report and define "significant" as economically viable for extraction.

Section 2.2.3 ends with the Governor's "Opportunity Returns" goals that specify "investing in renewable energy and the environment." There's a limited supply of uranium, which is expected to run out in a few decades, so nuclear power is clearly not renewable.

Another Governor goal is "encouraging investment and opening markets." Nuclear power in an age of terrorism is far too expensive to encourage investment without huge taxpayer subsidies. Otherwise, no rational investor would put money into nuclear power, just as the experts of risk management, insurance companies, would not fully insure nuclear power plants.

Anothe Governor goal is "investing in entreprenuership and innovation." New products for energy efficiency would accomplish this goal at significantly less cost and the Governor recently proposed at standard of improving statewide efficiency 25 percent. Some energy experts believe 50 percent savings are possible from energy efficiency alone, eliminating the need for any nuclear reactors in Illinois and providing us with a far more affordable, efficient, and sustainable economy. These cost savings would allow us to meet the Governor's other two goals of improving transportation and education/job training.

CC: Dave Kraft <neis@neis.org>

Mail Envelope Properties (4295497E.20F : 9 : 49679)

Subject: Comments on Draft EIS (report # NUREG-1815)
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 11:58 PM
From: George Gore <geo_gore@yahoo.com>

Created By: geo_gore@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

neis.org
neis CC (Dave Kraft)

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov
	neis.org

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6942	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 11:58 PM
Mime.822	8211	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Joseph Malherek" <jmalherek@citizen.org>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 11:54 PM
Subject: Comments on EIS for Exelon ESP (NUREG-1815; 70 FR 12022)

RDB Kenyon
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

Dear Mr. Lesar:

Attached you will find the comments of Public Citizen on the NRC's draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Early Site Permit (ESP) at Exelon's ESP site at the Clinton Power Station near Clinton, Illinois. These comments are presented in response to a notice published in the March 10, 2005 issue of the Federal Register (Vol. 70, No. 46, pg. 12022).

3/10/05
70FR 12022

Please enter these comments into the official record on this proceeding.

Sincerely,

Joseph P. Malherek
Policy Analyst, Public Citizen's Critical Mass Energy Program

146

Joseph P. Malherek

Policy Analyst
Critical Mass Energy and Environment Program
PUBLIC CITIZEN
215 Pennsylvania Ave SE
Washington, DC 20003
Phone: 202-454-5109
Fax: 202-547-7392
E-mail: jmalherek@citizen.org
www.energyactivist.org

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42954866.1E6 : 18 : 49638)

Subject: Comments on EIS for Exelon ESP (NUREG-1815; 70 FR 12022)
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 11:53 PM
From: "Joseph Malherek" <jmalherek@citizen.org>

Created By: jmalherek@citizen.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	803	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 11:53 PM
clintondeiscomments.pdf	115791	
Mime.822	160590	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Brian Lutenegger" <blutenegger@yahoo.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:41 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Brian Lutenegger
102 E. Gorham Street
Madison, WI 53703

3/10/05
70FR12022
(47)

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Brian J. Lutenegger

Mail Envelope Properties (4295374D.F1E : 6 : 48926)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:41 PM
From: "Brian Lutenegger" <blutenegger@yahoo.com>

Created By: blutenegger@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5255	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 10:41 PM
Mime.822	6317	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Thomas Phillips" <ChattTom@Bellsouth.Net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:39 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Thomas Phillips
5501 Dayton Blvd. #23
Chattanooga , TN 37415

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(48)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lyle Phillips
(423) 875-0130

Mail Envelope Properties (429536F0.EFE : 24 : 48894)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:39 PM
From: "Thomas Phillips" <ChattTom@Bellsouth.Net>

Created By: ChattTom@Bellsouth.Net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5276	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 10:39 PM
Mime.822	6339	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Catherine Miller" <cmiller@knox.edu>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:31 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Catherine Miller
2 E. South St. K-1118
Galesburg, IL 61401

3/10/05
70FR12022
(149)

RDB Receipt
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Catherine Millrt

Mail Envelope Properties (429534FC.EA0 : 5 : 48800)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:31 PM
From: "Catherine Miller" <cmiller@knox.edu>

Created By: cmiller@knox.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5254	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 10:31 PM
Mime.822	6311	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "James Clarke" <j.b.clarke_690@msn.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jun 10, 2005 7:44 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

James Clarke
18907 Point Lookout Road
Lexington Park, Md 20653

3/10/05
70FR12022

50

RECEIVED
2005 JUN 14 AM 9:38
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

June 10, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kempson (TJK2)

ESP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

James B Clarke
(301) 737-1261

Mail Envelope Properties (42AA2480.20B : 16 : 29195)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Fri, Jun 10, 2005 7:38 PM
From: "James Clarke" <j.b.clarke_690@msn.com>

Created By: j.b.clarke_690@msn.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5273	Friday, June 10, 2005 7:38 PM
Mime.822	6333	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Gwenn Carver" <gwenn_carver@dot.ca.gov>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 8:47 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Gwenn Carver
2891 Canyon Crest Dr. #29
Riverside, CA 92507

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(51)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Gwenn Carver
(951)369-3240

Mail Envelope Properties (42951C86.A19 : 21 : 47641)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 8:46 PM
From: "Gwenn Carver" <gwenn_carver@dot.ca.gov>

Created By: gwenn_carver@dot.ca.gov

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5264	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 8:46 PM
Mime.822	6325	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Rosalie Hewitt" <rosalieg@citlink.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 8:05 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Rosalie Hewitt
13 Brown St., Apt. 12 A
Norwich, NY 13815

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
52

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Rosalie Hewitt
607-334-3413

Mail Envelope Properties (429512BB.7CB : 6 : 47051)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 8:04 PM
From: "Rosalie Hewitt" <rosalieg@citlink.net>

Created By: rosalieg@citlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5263	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 8:04 PM
Mime.822	6324	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Marty/LaNell G" <mlgreenb@hotmail.com>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 7:15 PM
Subject: Clinton EIS Comment

8/10/05
70FR12022
(53)

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TSK2)

7

Dear NRC Staff, I was unable to attend the public meeting discussing the EIS of the Exelon early site permit in Clinton, IL on 4/19/05 and, so, wanted to submit my comments now. I have grown up in Central Illinois, having lived in Decatur, Urbana, and Normal all of my life. My wife, 2 children and I now live in Normal, IL.....only 30 minutes from Clinton. After all that I have heard and read over the years, I do not believe that nuclear power is safe. I am against the building of a new reactor in Clinton for the following reasons: 1) With the terrorist risk in our country, a new reactor becomes a new target. Too risky. 2) There is a risk of a potentially serious accident, which would endanger most of Central Illinois, let alone areas east of Illinois. 3) There is no safe means to store spent nuclear fuel. It is not acceptable to bury radioactive nuclear waste on site or anywhere. Doing so creates an enormous health risk for all living creatures (including people) that could contact the material for thousands of years.

If these arguments don't constitute reasons to deny the early site permit, I can't imagine what would. Another reactor in Clinton would be unsafe, and therefore, you should make the right decision to deny the permit. Sincerely, Marty Greenberg

Mail Envelope Properties (4295071F.4ED : 22 : 46317)

Subject: Clinton EIS Comment
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 7:15 PM
From: "Marty/LaNell G" <mlgreenb@hotmail.com>

Created By: mlgreenb@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
TEXT.htm	2186	
Mime.822	3157	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Faith Vis" <fvis@nep.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 7:12 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Faith Vis
RR 1 Box 65D
New Milford, PA 18834

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

ADB Receipt

3/10/05
70FR 12022
(54)

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Faith Vis
570 434 9372

Mail Envelope Properties (42950662.4C6 : 8 : 46278)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 7:12 PM
From: "Faith Vis" <fvis@nep.net>

Created By: fvis@nep.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5246	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 7:12 PM
Mime.822	6294	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: <aroundabout@route24.net>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 6:49 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1815

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
55
RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

Comments on NUREG-1815

From: Elizabeth Burns, RR # 3 Box 221, Clinton, IL 61727
To: ClintonEIS@nrc.gov

In response to Exelon's proposed Clinton II ESP.

There are many issues surrounding the appropriateness of placing a second nuclear reactor on the Clinton, Illinois site. I will address each of these in turn. In short, I do not agree with the NRC's evaluation and recommendation that the ESP be approved and permitted. It appears that all too often the overriding reason given for approval was that this is a "low risk" area. As a resident within the 5 mile zone of the current plant, I do not consider myself or my neighbors "not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource" if some major incident should occur at the plant site and we "disappear" due to illness or death from a radiological event.

Site Access:

Exelon states in the ESP, "access to the site is limited primarily by Illinois Route 54." If access in either direction were limited via Route 54, then Emergency Responders would be unable to access the plant. Clinton I relies heavily on the volunteer emergency responders in the outlying communities. Even the closest community would have to take time to reach the plant, clear security, and reach the scene. To have both an operating plant and construction of a new plant being done concurrently would be of much more than a small or medium risk. It simply places too much of a burden on local law and emergency responders.

Roads:

Most of the bridges leading to and from the plant either on Route 54 or 10 are posted with weight limits. This is of major concern when considering the nuclear waste that will have to transported out of DeWitt County at sometime in the future (unless our neighborhood is going to become a designated high-level nuclear waste dump). Both highway and railroad bridges are more likely than not going to be unable to support the waste casks weights. Upgrades may be a possibility, but then again, access to the plant for emergency measures will be limited by lane closures and repairs making it a more attractive target for either foreign or domestic terrorism.

And township roads are not up to the task of handling heavy traffic weights or flows. The road which runs directly north of the entrance to the plant (for instance) is barely a two-lane road, and has many twists and turns. It definitely would not be a suitable alternate route for either construction equipment or waste removal as some parties have stated.

This is a rural area, and the transportation system was built as such. This, in turn, creates a funnel effect both into and out of the plant. It is not a suitable situation for security in today's global climate. Exelon would be

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TSK2)

depending on federal troops to help "defend" the site, and this will cost taxpayers dearly.

Lake:

Since Clinton Lake may be used for cooling, both the temperature effects and the draw down amounts should be considered more seriously than has been done. One needs only look back to 1988 to witness the effects drought can have on the Lake. In the North Fork, Salt Creek dried up completely for nearly half a mile, cutting off water supply near the transmission pole crossing. I do have pictures to attest to this.

The dam is not allowing for the normal "flushing out" of silt from the creek that used to occur, thus silt deposition occurs in the lake. Dredging may be an answer, but it also carries with it some negative environmental consequences.

The lake itself has been placed on the IEPA's list of impaired waters and even received a violation due to temperature increases. Fish kills have happened repeatedly, one of the most recent during a routine shutdown of the current plant.

Following September 11, 2001, the lake was shut down to all visitors. "There were 972,616 visitors
to the lake in 2000 (Exelon 2003a)". It seems that there would be a significant economic problem should this have to done again. It would appear that it might have to be done if construction is ongoing at an active plant. I would hope that lake access would be tightly controlled to limit access by water. For the months that the lake was shutdown through 2002, DeWitt County and the surrounding communities claimed major economic impacts.

There are many other problems with this ESP, but because of the way the laws are written to "support" nuclear energy, I am sure they will be glossed over, ignored, or considered "Low Risk". Time and again the NRC has stated that we can't consider the waste, we can't consider the type of reactor to be built, we can't consider the actual need for this type of energy production. We can't. But what it will boil down to, one way or another, is that we SHOULD.

This country has a sad history of waiting and reacting to situations instead of being proactive on issues that will affect more people down the road, not just those within the "dead zone". According to the current analysis of this project, DeWitt County is an expendable county, as are the people within that geographic region. That is what "Low Risk" means. Approval of this ESP is simply a license for exploitation of human, economic, and natural resources. Exelon may still make money, but we will be paying the bill.

Mail Envelope Properties (42950108.37A : 1 : 45946)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1815
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 6:49 PM
From: <aroundabout@route24.net>

Created By: aroundabout@route24.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5393	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 6:49 PM
Mime.822	6445	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(56)

RDB Received

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

From: "Vic & Cindy" <V.Connor@insightbb.com>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 5:07 PM
Subject: Questions about NUREG-1815

May 25, 2005

Dear Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

I've finished skimming thru the ESP site document, NUREG-1815, for the Clinton Nuclear Power Plant #2. The following are my questions and comments.

The first thing that bothers me about this 650 page document is that there is no index. Today, it is a trivial matter for anyone using word processors like Microsoft Word and others to add an index to any document. Why wouldn't they put in an index of major topics in such an important document?

The following are my questions listed by ascending page number:

1-2 lines 9-21 State that Exelon does not have to specify what type of reactor it will design and will use a composite of different possibilities for its "Plant Parameter Envelope." Doesn't this mean it must use the worst characteristics of the possible reactors it may build to make any estimates?

2-4 Has a map of the Clinton area and it is clearly outdated, by at least ten years. For example, Highway 51 no longer goes thru Clinton. Why use such outdated information?

2-11 lines 31-38 state the prevailing wind at the Clinton Power Plant in ALL months is from the South? But isn't it really from the West or Southwest? Did they make a mistake?
Also, wind speeds are 8mph in summer and 11mph in winter. Are these averages?

2-53 lines 26-35 shows the assessed value for CPS (Clinton Power Station) dropping dramatically from $558 million in 1996 to $165 million in 2003. This means that the tax base for this power plant has dropped to less than 30% of its value 7 years earlier and it shows no indication of stopping there. Will the new plant also end up quickly reducing tax revenue for DeWitt County?

4-38 lines 14-26 talk about thermoluminescent dosimeters (TLDs) that measure gamma radiation as far as 5 kilometers (3 miles) from the power plant and their measurements are from 13 to 21 mrems and yet a dosimeter is much smaller than a person. This brings up two disturbing items.
First, on page 2-17 above, they state that a member of the public will get a maximum of only 0.003 mrem per year and yet 5 kilometers away from the power plant, they are measuring over 13 mrems per year. Second, they are specifically talking about gamma radiation that the TLDs measure; however, it is the alpha radiation that is more damaging to people and animals. Why aren't they talking about alpha radiation? Gamma radiation falls off at the rate of the inverse square law, alpha particles can be breathed in or ingested and damage your body tremendously!

SFSP Review Complete

E-RIDS= ADM-03

Add= T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template= ADM-013

5-19 lines 24-28 show that the average temperature of Lake Clinton has gone up 14 degrees Fahrenheit since the CPS became operational. Won't a second reactor heat up the lake to dangerous bacteria producing levels?

5-21 lines 1-5 show that because of this increase in temperature, the dissolved oxygen (DO) in the lake has gone down from 10.2 mg/L to 7.8 mg/L. Further, they state that 5.0 mg/L of DO is necessary for a healthy aquatic community. In other words, the oxygen content of the lake has gone down 23% and if it goes down 27% more of its pre-CPS level, then the aquatic life will be seriously impacted. Is this going to happen?

5-34 lines 23-24 state that up to 580 employees will be permanently employed at the CPS. Is this really true? The CPS was fully operational in 1987, but by 1996 the CPS was closed for two and a half years. Did those permanent employees stay in the area for two and a half years while it was non-operational?

5-35 lines 32-34 state that everyone, state of Illinois, DeWitt County and the city of Clinton, would get taxes from the CPS for at least 60 years. First, how do they know this? Page 2-53 above shows how the assessed value of CPS has gone down dramatically in less than 7 years.

5-44 lines 3-22 state that "lake temperatures from the plant intake to the discharge appear to be about 5 degrees Fahrenheit warmer on average," however, they stated in 5-19 that "the average temperature of Lake Clinton has gone up 14 degrees." This means that the water by the discharge must be more than 20 degrees above normal. In addition, they state that increased temperatures can greatly increase the number of thermophilic microorganisms, which can be "causative agents of potentially serious human infections." Won't the second nuclear reactor's heat cause for the growth of more of these microorganisms?

5-52 lines 24-27 talk about gamma and beta radiation. However, it is the alpha radiation that is more worrisome and incredibly damaging to biological organisms. Why don't they talk about alpha radiation?

6-3 shows that 118,000 metric-tons (2,200 pounds per metric-ton) of coal, 323,000 mega-Watt-hours of electricity and 135,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas are used to make the nuclear fuel. This is not a greenhouse gas-free process.

6-4 shows that 240,000 metric-tons of tailings and 91,000 metric-tons of solids are generated making the nuclear fuel. In terms of radiation producing elements created, 18,000 Curies of Tritium and 400,000 Curies of Krypton-85 are produced per year.
6-4 shows that 240,000 metric-tons of tailings and 91,000 metric-tons of solids are generated making the nuclear fuel. In terms of radiation producing elements created, 18,000 Curies of Tritium and 400,000 Curies of Krypton-85 are produced per year. And yet this is listed in the effluents. Isn't this a tremendous amount of radioactive material to be vented into the surrounding atmosphere?

6-6 shows a figure that draws an object that represents the "proposed Federal Waste Repository." This is now known to be the Yucca Flats Repository in Nevada that is also known to be non-functional. So the spent nuclear fuel has no place to go. Where are you going to put it?

Thanks for considering these comments.

Victor Connor
302 Melody Lane
Normal, IL 61761

Mail Envelope Properties (4294E8ED.BAA : 1 : 43946)

Subject: Questions about NUREG-1815
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 5:09 PM
From: "Vic & Cindy" <V.Connor@insightbb.com>

Created By: V.Connor@insightbb.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5918	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 5:09 PM
TEXT.htm	7711	
Mime.822	15352	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(57)

RDB Received

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

From: "Samuel Galewsky" <sgalewsky@mail.millikin.edu>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 4:54 PM
Subject: Statement

Thank you for allowing me to comment on the Draft Environmental impact statement for the proposed new reactor at the Clinton Power Station. I am a concerned citizen who lives within 25 miles of the reactor. Before the NRC approves this impact statement I demand the following additional information be obtained and evaluated.

1) Public health records dramatically show a decrease in infant mortality rates in downwind counties when the reactor was non functional from 1996-1999. The rates jumped back to their current higher levels when the reactor was re-started. No such change in mortality levels was observed in the upwind counties. I demand that before an impact statement can be approved a complete epidemiological study of the surrounding counties be carried out that establishes rates of leukemia, autism, childhood cancers, infant mortality and compares these data with all counties within a 50 mile radius. I further insist that an independent scientific review board be established to analyze this data..

2) In order to have adequate data to clearly asses the environmental impact of the proposed and current nuclear power station I insist that a real time radiation monitoring system showing effluent releases, amounts, radiation levels and wind direction be implemented for all perimeter detector systems. This data must be made available to the public at all times via the internet. The NRC's current effluent data collection methods and availability for public analysis is totally inadequate.

3) It is impossible to develop an accurate impact assessment without a reactor design specified. Just the issue of reactor cooling alone makes the generic aspect of this statement worthless. I demand that a reactor design type be specified before this environmental impact statement be approved.

Samuel Galewsky, Ph.D.
2009 E. Taylor St.
Bloomington IL, 61701

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Mail Envelope Properties (4294E60F.A72 : 14 : 43634)

Subject: Statement
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 4:53 PM
From: "Samuel Galewsky" <sgalewsky@mail.millikin.edu>

Created By: sgalewsky@mail.millikin.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1919	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 4:53 PM
Mime.822	2695	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

3/10/05

70FR12022

(58)

RDB/Recipient

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:02

From: Dave Kraft <neis@neis.org>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 2:56 PM
Subject: NEIS comments ion Clinton EIS

May 25, 2005

TO: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
RE: Comments of NEIS on the Clinton ESP, Clinton ESP Site Docket No. 52-007-ESP

The following are additional comments from Nuclear Energy Information Service concerning the Draft EIS Statement for the Early Site Permit at Exelon's Clinton reactor site. We ask that these be entered into the formal record.

Document General Comments:

The entire DEIS review is developed, analyzed and written in such a manner as to divorce it from the real world. It may represent a "necessary" slavish adherence to regulatory details. However, it is totally insufficient to protect the public health and safety.

Frequently, the assumptions put forth by Exelon are simply those that serve its narrow interests. Whether they are accurate or not is rarely if ever challenged. The NRC staff seem to accept most of these uncritically; if there were any criticisms, these are not well documented or provide rationale. What we end up with is a largely self-serving set of GIGO inputs from Exelon, to which NRC staff seem to nod positively as if they were dash-board dollies. Significant matters are often left out of the discussion, because they are "regulatorily" outside the scope of these proceedings.

We would submit that, for example, while the crash of a 500+ton Airbus A-380 Jumbo jet loaded with 300,000 litres of aviation fuel coming out of the world's busiest airport only 27 minutes away into the poorly protected spent fuel pool of the Clinton-1 reactor might have some environmental significance worth analyzing. But is seems, regulations preclude this possibility.

So, what we end up with here is a process that largely satisfies the regulatory "necessities" of conducting these proceedings, without sufficiently contributing to providing environmental protection. We do hope that NRC abandons this practice in the future.

Section Specific Comments:

Section 8.00 - Alternatives:

General Comments: The scenarios and positions of Exelon, and those of NRC staff analyzing the Impacts of Renewables are selectively narrow and self-serving; and totally incomplete. They further fail to examine and therefore take into account very realistic scenarios of aggressive growth in the renewable energy sector in the next 15 years, the period during which new reactors might be contemplated for the Clinton site.

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

One such realistic factor is the intention of the State of Illinois to institute a renewable energy portfolio standard as soon as 2006. This change on the law would require utilities to achieve real, on the ground targeted additions to capacity coming exclusively from the renewables sector. Benchmarks and timelines are already publicly available for analysis.

It should also be noted that in Illinois, the bulk of such capacity is likely to come from expansion of wind energy. The State notes that 3,119 MW of installed wind capacity has been proposed for Illinois - roughly three times the size of the single reactor proposed for the Clinton site. Further, the entire capacity projected for the Midwest amounts to 11,759 MW of proposed installed wind capacity alone - nearly 12 times the size of the proposed Clinton reactor. Addition of such large amounts of State mandated renewables capacity totally eviscerates the proposed need for the Clinton site reactor, either as a baseload generator providing for in-state power, or as a merchant plant selling to region about to experience a further glut of power.

The facts that both Exelon and NRC staff failed to take this into account calls into serious question their assumptions and methodology used for reaching their conclusions.

NEIS staff has examined their conclusions, and find them erroneous and without adequate justification. We do not concur with their findings.

Sec. 8.2.1.3
It is stated that, "Exelon did not consider nuclear power plants license renewal in its ER." NRC staff concurs with this position, stating that license renewal does not add additional generating capacity.

This has already been proven wrong historically. The power up-rate process HAS already resulted in added capacity from existing plants. Using the staff and Exelon assumption that the plant at the Clinton site would be a merchant plant, it must therefore take into account the possibility of added capacity coming from other already existing reactors within the region in which the merchant plant would compete. To fail to take this into account demonstrates the lack of thoroughness on the part of Exelon and NRC staff in developing and analyzing scenarios based on demonstrated historic and potential industry operation. This erodes confidence in their conclusions significantly.

NEIS staff has examined their conclusions, and find them erroneous and without adequate justification. We do not concur with their findings.

Sec. 8.2.2 Alternatives Requiring New Generating Capacity (Introductory paragraph)
The premises put forth by Exelon and endorsed by NRC staff in the introductory statements of this section are flawed and unnecessarily restrictive. They do not reflect adequately realistic possibilities in the area of renewables. Further, what is "technically reasonable and commercially viable" is totally in the hands of those with a clear agenda to build more nuclear plants, making this and the following statements and analysis a self-fulfilling prophecy, not an objective analysis of the realistic possibilities.

NEIS staff has examined their premises, and find them erroneous and without adequate justification. We do not concur with their initial premise, and therefore do not accept the erroneous conclusions emanating from them.

Sec. 8.2.3.1 Wind
The examination of the potential of wind capacity both in Illinois and in the region in which a merchant plant would sell power is seriously flawed and understated, so much so as to be a worthless conclusion.

Sec. 8.2.3.8 Fuel Cells
The examination of the potential for fuel cells is much too cursory and quickly dismissed. Again it suffers from the same self-fulfilling prophecy thinking that characterizes much of the renewables section.

Sec. 8.2.3.10 Combination of Alternatives
This section also suffers from significant lack of detail, and willingness on the part of either Exelon or NRC staff to think outside of the box. What may be "acceptable" to Exelon for analysis as potential "partnering" combinations of alternatives may not be acceptable to the State of Illinois as part of the Renewables Portfolio Standards, or to local people who may have other energy assets that are being ignored.

Section 3.3 Transmission System

While the formal details of filing for interconnection to the grid are noted, the section fails to examine in any realistic manner the implications of and lessons learned from the Canadian and East Coast blackout of 2004. This is especially egregious an omission, given that a formal Task Force headed by the Lt. Governor of Illinois examined these transmission issues in detail. Failure to even acknowledge this formal, well-publicized and readily available report indicates a lack of thoroughness on the part of both Exelon and NRC staff indicating that their examination of transmission issues were largely perfunctory, and not based on real world conditions. If the population lived inside regulatory manuals, we'd all be safe. Out here, it's a different story.

This perfunctory treatment fails to acknowledge the real world interaction between grid reliability and reactor operation. No mention is made that grid failure jeopardizes onsite power for reactors, a matter of high safety and environmental significance. The Section fails to provide meaningful or public examination into Exelon's record of back-up diesel generator failure, significant during grid blackouts; nor of NRC"s unwillingness to allow for PV solar panels to power offsite sirens and EWS devices in the event of offsite grid failure, also of high safety and environmental significance.

The opposite is equally true - reactor malfunctions like SCRAMS affect grid reliability as well. No discussion of this is present in this section.

Exelon speaks of the need for 4 new transmission lines, resulting in broadening - nearly doubling the size of -- the rights of way through the surrounding land. While this may be within some abstract regulatory guidelines and limits, it is of significant consequences to the

immediate land use in the area. Further, once these alterations are made, they are more or less permanent depending on terrain, whether the reactor gets finished or not; or whether the reactor lives out is expected useful life. The environmental degradation is not easily reversed or mitigated.

CONCLUSION:

NEIS has chosen to focus on two narrow aspects of the DEIS process for the proposed Clinton reactor. While the specific criticisms certainly apply, they also demonstrate the "generic" flaw in the whole process that calls its entire validity and reliability into question: while it is necessary to be in regulatory compliance, merely being in compliance should not be mistaken for being sufficient to protect the public. We believe that the aggregate of the criticisms, if thoroughly, genuinely and objectively examined would lead a reasonable person to conclude "no need" for the proposed Clinton reactor. Terminating the process early will save everyone - the public, NRC, even Exelon - significant amounts of time and money, both better spent on a sustainable and renewable energy future. We therefore urge NRC to reject the Exelon request for an Early Site Permit at the Clinton site.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments from NEIS

Submitted, this day,

David A. Kraft
Director
NEIS

--
Dave Kraft, Director
Nuclear Energy Information Service
P.O. Box 1637
Evanston, IL 60204-1637
Evanston: (847)869-7650; -7658 fax
Hamburg: +49-40-430-7332
Neis@neis.org
www.neis.org

Mail Envelope Properties (4294CA4D.BE6 : 15 : 39910)

Subject: NEIS comments ion Clinton EIS
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 2:53 PM
From: Dave Kraft <neis@neis.org>

Created By: neis@neis.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	10074	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 2:53 PM
TEXT.htm	11503	
NEIS DEIS comments.doc	220160	
Mime.822	325300	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

Nuclear Energy Information Service

"Illinois' Nuclear Power Watchdog for 24 years"

Box 1637, Evanston, IL 60204 office: 845 Chicago Avenue, #207, Evanston, IL 60202
(847)869-7650; -7658 fax www.neis.org neis@neis.org

May 25, 2005

TO: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
RE: Comments of NEIS on the Clinton ESP, Clinton ESP Site Docket No. 52-007-ESP

The following are additional comments from Nuclear Energy Information Service concerning the Draft EIS Statement for the Early Site Permit at Exelon's Clinton reactor site. We ask that these be entered into the formal record.

Document General Comments:

The entire DEIS review is developed, analyzed and written in such a manner as to divorce it from the real world. It may represent a "necessary" slavish adherence to regulatory details. However, it is totally insufficient to protect the public health and safety.

Frequently, the assumptions put forth by Exelon are simply those that serve its narrow interests. Whether they are accurate or not is rarely if ever challenged. The NRC staff seem to accept most of these uncritically; if there were any criticisms, these are not well documented or provide rationale. What we end up with is a largely self-serving set of GIGO inputs from Exelon, to which NRC staff seem to nod positively as if they were dash-board dollies. Significant matters are often left out of the discussion, because they are "regulatorily" outside the scope of these proceedings.

We would submit that, for example, while the crash of a 500+ton Airbus A-380 Jumbo jet loaded with 300,000 litres of aviation fuel coming out of the world's busiest airport only 27 minutes away into the poorly protected spent fuel pool of the Clinton-1 reactor might have some environmental significance worth analyzing. But is seems, regulations preclude this possibility.

So, what we end up with here is a process that largely satisfies the regulatory "necessities" of conducting these proceedings, without sufficiently contributing to providing environmental protection. We do hope that NRC abandons this practice in the future.

Section Specific Comments:

Section 8.00 – Alternatives:

General Comments: The scenarios and positions of Exelon, and those of NRC staff analyzing the Impacts of Renewables are selectively narrow and self-serving; and totally incomplete. They further fail to examine and therefore take into account very realistic scenarios of aggressive growth in the renewable energy sector in the next 15 years, the period during which new reactors might be contemplated for the Clinton site.

One such realistic factor is the intention of the State of Illinois to institute a renewable energy portfolio standard as soon as 2006. This change on the law would require utilities to achieve real, on the ground targeted additions to capacity coming exclusively from the renewables sector. Benchmarks and timelines are already publicly available for analysis.

It should also be noted that in Illinois, the bulk of such capacity is likely to come from expansion of wind energy. The State notes that 3,119 MW of installed wind capacity has been proposed for Illinois – roughly three times the size of the single reactor proposed for the Clinton site. Further, the entire capacity projected for the Midwest amounts to 11,759 MW of proposed installed wind capacity alone – nearly 12 times the size of the proposed Clinton reactor. Addition of such large amounts of State mandated renewables capacity totally eviscerates the proposed need for the Clinton site reactor, either as a baseload generator providing for in-state power, or as a merchant plant selling to region about to experience a further glut of power.

The facts that both Exelon and NRC staff failed to take this into account calls into serious question their assumptions and methodology used for reaching their conclusions.

NEIS staff has examined their conclusions, and find them erroneous and without adequate justification. We do not concur with their findings.

Sec. 8.2.1.3
It is stated that, "Exelon did not consider nuclear power plants license renewal in its ER." NRC staff concurs with this position, stating that license renewal does not add additional generating capacity.

This has already been proven wrong historically. The power up-rate process HAS already resulted in added capacity from existing plants. Using the staff and Exelon assumption that the plant at the Clinton site would be a merchant plant, it must therefore take into account the possibility of added capacity coming from other already existing reactors within the region in which the merchant plant would compete. To fail to take this into account demonstrates the lack of thoroughness on the part of Exelon and NRC staff in developing and analyzing scenarios based on demonstrated historic and potential industry operation. This erodes confidence in their conclusions significantly.

NEIS staff has examined their conclusions, and find them erroneous and without adequate justification. We do not concur with their findings.

Sec. 8.2.2 Alternatives Requiring New Generating Capacity (Introductory paragraph)
The premises put forth by Exelon and endorsed by NRC staff in the introductory statements of this section are flawed and unnecessarily restrictive. They do not reflect adequately realistic possibilities in the area of renewables. Further, what is "technically reasonable and commercially viable" is totally in the hands of those with a clear agenda to build more nuclear plants, making this and the following statements and analysis a self-fulfilling prophecy, not an objective analysis of the realistic possibilities.

NEIS staff has examined their premises, and find them erroneous and without adequate justification. We do not concur with their initial premise, and therefore do not accept the erroneous conclusions emanating from them.

Sec. 8.2.3.1 Wind
The examination of the potential of wind capacity both in Illinois and in the region in which a merchant plant would sell power is seriously flawed and understated, so much so as to be a worthless conclusion.

Sec. 8.2.3.8 Fuel Cells
The examination of the potential for fuel cells is much too cursory and quickly dismissed. Again it suffers from the same self-fulfilling prophecy thinking that characterizes much of the renewables section.

Sec. 8.2.3.10 Combination of Alternatives
This section also suffers from significant lack of detail, and willingness on the part of either Exelon or NRC staff to think outside of the box. What may be "acceptable" to Exelon for analysis as potential "partnering" combinations of alternatives may not be acceptable to the State of Illinois as part of the Renewables Portfolio Standards, or to local people who may have other energy assets that are being ignored.

Section 3.3 Transmission System

While the formal details of filing for interconnection to the grid are noted, the section fails to examine in any realistic manner the implications of and lessons learned from the Canadian and East Coast blackout of 2004. This is especially egregious an omission, given that a formal Task Force headed by the Lt. Governor of Illinois examined these transmission issues in detail. Failure to even acknowledge this formal, well-publicized and readily available report indicates a lack of thoroughness on the part of both Exelon and NRC staff indicating that their examination of transmission issues were largely perfunctory, and not based on real world conditions. If the population lived inside regulatory manuals, we'd all be safe. Out here, it's a different story.

This perfunctory treatment fails to acknowledge the real world interaction between grid reliability and reactor operation. No mention is made that grid failure jeopardizes onsite power for reactors, a matter of high safety and environmental significance. The Section fails to provide meaningful or public examination into Exelon's record of back-up diesel generator failure, significant during grid blackouts; nor of NRC"s unwillingness to allow for PV solar panels to power offsite sirens and EWS devices in the event of offsite grid failure, also of high safety and environmental significance.

The opposite is equally true – reactor malfunctions like SCRAMS affect grid reliability as well. No discussion of this is present in this section.

Exelon speaks of the need for 4 new transmission lines, resulting in broadening – nearly doubling the size of -- the rights of way through the surrounding land. While this may be within some abstract regulatory guidelines and limits, it is of significant consequences to the immediate land use in the area. Further, once these alterations are made, they are more or less permanent depending on terrain, whether the reactor gets finished or not; or whether the reactor lives out is expected useful life. The environmental degradation is not easily reversed or mitigated.

CONCLUSION:

NEIS has chosen to focus on two narrow aspects of the DEIS process for the proposed Clinton reactor. While the specific criticisms certainly apply, they also demonstrate the "generic" flaw in the whole process that calls its entire validity and reliability into question. We believe that the aggregate of the criticisms, if thoroughly, genuinely and objectively examined would lead a reasonable person to conclude "no need" for the proposed Clinton reactor. Terminating the process early will save everyone – the public, NRC, even Exelon – significant amounts of time and money, both better spent on a sustainable and renewable energy future. We therefore urge NRC to reject the Exelon request for an Early Site Permit at the Clinton site.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments from NEIS

Submitted, this day,

David A. Kraft
Director
NEIS

70 FR 12022
3/10/05

(59)

From: Tom Lutze <tlutze@titan.iwu.edu>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 1:53 PM
Subject: Concerns about EIS

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

To the Commission members who worked on the Clinton EIS,

I attended the meeting at the Junior High Schoool in Clinton on April 19. I had to leave the meeting before I was able to speak, but I would like to take this moment to make one general observation and then focus on one aspect of the meeting was VERY troublesome to me.

As to my general observation: Several people spoke up at the meeting saying things like, "I grew up within a short distance of a nuclear power plant and I'm ok; it proves that it's safe. I would like to reply to them. As a 53 year-old, I grew up not having any seat belts or child restraints in my car and I survived. Does that mean that I should support not wearing seat belts? The fact of the matter is that while I DID survive childhood without seat belts, I have not survived adulthood without cancer. 18 months ago, I was diagnosed with a life-threatening pancreatic cancer. Doctors don't know why I developed the tumor, but what I do know is that no one in my family ever had this kind of cancer, and here in Illinois we are all subjected to a vast array of carcinogens, including not only agricultural chemicals but also radiation from nuclear power plants. I want to know whether my cancer--and the growing numbers of cancers in our area--have been in any way triggered by nuclear power plant "venting" before we go ahead with more exposure. Taking such chances with our health, especially when other options--like wind--appear viable, seems unreasonable at best, and--if you've suffered through cancer, you know what I mean--inhuman at worst.

This brings me to my main concern about the April 19 meeting: When the issue of the wind alternative to a new nuclear generator was raised, the initial comment from the one member of the NRC team who was the "expert" on the subject (his name escapes me) was that the Draft EIS had not concluded one way or another on the viability of wind as an alternative energy source. It seemed that as the discussion proceeded and the wind alternative was again raised, he became more agitated until he personally concluded that "you'd have to cover the whole state of Illinois with windmills!", implying that wind is in fact NOT a viable choice.

There seemed to me to be two very serious problems with his comments:

First, he was implying that the electric generating capacity of the one new reactor at Clinton would equal the generating capacity of wind-farms covering the whole state--and that seems grossly inaccurate, no?

Second, and most importantly, he seemed--on the spot, and personally, with no scientific data--to be drawing a conclusion in defense of nuclear power and against the wind alternative, a conclusion that he himself had admitted earlier in the meeting the commission report (EIS) had not addressed one way or the other.

I think his remarks are an egregious example of pro-nuclear bias trumping a thorough study of alternatives--and an especially obvious bias at a time when the largest wind-farm in the world is planned for construction just 25

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

miles away from Clinton! One of the speakers at the meeting, Sandra Lindberg, voiced her concern--mine, too--that the ESP process is a sham. This committee member's action was a perfect example of what Sandra was talking about. It was very troubling.

I would like to think that with the best interests of the environment--most especially human health--in mind, the EIS would look much more closely at alternatives to nuclear power that are renewable, have zero emissions, and do not create radioactive waste that we and our kids and their kids will have to contend with.

Sincerely,

Tom Lutze
Normal, IL

Mail Envelope Properties (4294BB9A.30C : 24 : 37644)

Subject: Concerns about EIS
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 1:54 PM
From: Tom Lutze <tlutze@titan.iwu.edu>

Created By: tlutze@titan.iwu.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3711	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 1:54 PM
TEXT.htm	3995	
Mime.822	8910	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "angela mccomb" <angela_mccomb@ccsn.nevada.edu>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 1:09 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

angela mccomb
1900 merze ave
henderson, nv 89015

3/10/05
70 FR 12022

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

60

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

angela mccomb
702 651 4520

Mail Envelope Properties (4294B126.C93 : 17 : 35987)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 1:08 PM
From: "angela mccomb" <angela_mccomb@ccsn.nevada.edu>

Created By: angela_mccomb@ccsn.nevada.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5254	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 1:08 PM
Mime.822	6323	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Joyce Long" <joyslong@att.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:30 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Joyce Long
7 Marine Street
Huntgtington, NY 11743

3/10/05
70 FR 12022

(61)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

RDB received

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template= ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.
Amen!
Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Joyce Long

Mail Envelope Properties (4294A831.7E2 : 16 : 34786)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:30 PM
From: "Joyce Long" <joyslong@att.net>

Created By: joyslong@att.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5245	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 12:30 PM
Mime.822	6296	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Barbra Tompkins" <evanb8@earthlink.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:02 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Barbra Tompkins
192 A Kapuahi St.
Makawao, hi 96768

3/10/05
70FR12022

(62)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

ADM Received

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Barbra Tompkins

Mail Envelope Properties (4294A18E.479 : 18 : 33913)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:02 PM
From: "Barbra Tompkins" <evanb8@earthlink.net>

Created By: evanb8@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5246	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 12:02 PM
Mime.822	6305	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Marie Overall" <okimarie@earthlink.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 11:51 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Marie Overall
3165 S 500 E
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

3/10/05
70FR12022
63

ADB Receipt
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Marie Overall
801-484-9893

Mail Envelope Properties (42949EE3.235 : 13 : 33333)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 11:50 AM
From: "Marie Overall" <okimarie@earthlink.net>

Created By: okimarie@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5257	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 11:50 AM
Mime.822	6319	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Katherine Jenkins-Murphy" <SnowLeopard44@webtv.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:45 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Katherine Jenkins-Murphy
208 S.E. Twig Ave.
Port St. Lucie, FL 34983

3/10/05
70 FR 12022

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

(64)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RFDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TSK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Katherine Jenkins-Murphy
772-336-8041

Mail Envelope Properties (42948F74.717 : 17 : 30487)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 10:44 AM
From: "Katherine Jenkins-Murphy" <SnowLeopard44@webtv.net>

Created By: SnowLeopard44@webtv.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5286	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 10:44 AM
Mime.822	6360	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Alan Carlson" <discern@visi.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 7:39 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RTB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

Alan Carlson
2301 Long Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55114

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
65

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Alan Carlson
651-646-2536

Mail Envelope Properties (42946400.30D : 12 : 25357)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 7:39 AM
From: "Alan Carlson" <discern@visi.com>

Created By: discern@visi.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5255	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 7:39 AM
Mime.822	6310	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Sue Wedzel" <swedzel@direcway.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 6:20 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Sue Wedzel
470 Bruin Lake Rd.
Gregory, MI 48137

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(64)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. J. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Sue Wedzel

Mail Envelope Properties (42945154.DD2 : 23 : 24018)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 6:19 AM
From: "Sue Wedzel" <swedzel@direcway.com>

Created By: swedzel@direcway.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5237	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 6:19 AM
Mime.822	6289	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Don Cramer" <dwcramer@st-tel.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:56 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Don Cramer
102 West Road 200
Healy, KS 67850

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(67)

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Don Cramer
(620) 398-2332

Mail Envelope Properties (42940573.AE6 : 4 : 19174)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:56 AM
From: "Don Cramer" <dwcramer@st-tel.net>

Created By: dwcramer@st-tel.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5249	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 12:56 AM
Mime.822	6303	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Thomas Connor" <TConnor@hvc.rr.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:22 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Thomas Connor
17 Dubois Street
Wallkill, NY 12589

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(68)

RDB Receipt
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:01

May 25, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TSK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Thomas Connor
8458955471

Mail Envelope Properties (4293FD64.8B4 : 17 : 18612)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:21 AM
From: "Thomas Connor" <TConnor@hvc.rr.com>

Created By: TConnor@hvc.rr.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5253	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 12:21 AM
Mime.822	6309	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

3/10/05

70FR12022

(69)

RDB Receipt
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

From: Professor Sandra Lindberg <slindber@iwu.edu>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:12 AM
Subject: Statement on Clinton Draft EIS

5/24/05

Copied into this email, and attached as RTF documents, are my statements regarding the NRC's draft EIS for the proposed Clinton Reactor #2. Please include them in the public record on this site and submit them for NRC consideration.

Sincerely,

Sandra Lindberg
Founding Member
No New Nukes

NRC Regulations and Licensing Process Hopelessly Flawed:
EIS Not Accurate Way to Judge Site Suitability for Second Reactor in Clinton

Prepared by Sandra Lindberg
2009 E. Taylor St.
Bloomington, IL 61701
309-664-0403

Two years ago the NRC and Exelon first announced the possibility of a second reactor in Clinton. I asked at a meeting like this one how many protesters and how much critical information would be needed to stop this project. I was told that it didn't matter if there was one protester or 1,000, the reactor would be built as long as the NRC could prove it was following federal regulations in the site approval and licensing process.1

Two years have gone by. I've read and studied nuclear engineering textbooks mostly intent on prolonging a beleaguered industry.2 I've also found the scientists, physicians and epidemiologists not on the nuclear industry payroll, whose research I find more convincing.3 The experts in this room don't appeal to me much. Nor does this sham of a process. And here's the 'core' of my complaint.

On the NRC's website4 they proclaim their statement of purpose: they exist to safeguard the health and safety of U.S. citizens. In fact, the NRC was created to end the abuse of its predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission, which became a cheerleader for the civilian reactor, rather than its watchdog. The spirit with which the NRC was created was a good one--it was supposed to put citizen interests first, though it's always had trouble sticking to this assignment. In the 1970's, for example, ex-commissioners of the NRC were testifying at congressional hearings about the NRC's rush to license new plants regardless of safety concerns being raised about them.5

Unfortunately, the NRC has a bad habit of forgetting why it was created. It's become a letter-of-the-law commission. Current NRC

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

regulations are written to favor the nuclear industry, not U.S. citizens. For example, the Early Site Permit process is not supposed to examine radioactive waste issues or reactor design. The NRC also refuses to analyze studies that challenge existing radiation standards, instead trotting out its favorite pro-nuke studies without examining new data in a substantive way.6 These regulations stymie the NRC's ability to fulfill its mandate. Approving generic designs and what it calls the "plant parameter envelope" does not protect the people in this room, no matter what trappings the NRC uses to dress up its opinions.

This new reactor in Clinton, by necessity will include the equivalent of a waste dump. How can the NRC evaluate the site without researching how Exelon plans to handle its waste?

This new reactor may or may not include a containment building for its radioactive core. How can the NRC evaluate the site's suitability without knowing what kind of a reactor Exelon intends?

A study of populations downwind of the Clinton reactor, as well as similar studies of people living downwind of eight other reactors, strongly suggest that current radiation emission standards are unsafe.7 How does the NRC protect us when it dismisses critical studies by quibbling about sample size or by citing a flawed study by the National Cancer Institute that concludes there is no danger for citizens who live near nuclear reactors? How many infants are to die, and how many people are to contract cancer before the NRC decides the incidence numbers are high enough to warrant further study?

The NRC's slavish adherence to its carefully engineered regulations flies in the face of its own mission statement.

A couple thousand years ago the notion of the importance of a law's spirit emerged out of the Middle East. There, a very brave Jew dared to break holy laws; he healed a man on the Sabbath. When he was criticized, he replied that he was observing the spirit of the holy laws. That idea has wound its way into western culture--for the good, I believe. Martin Luther King, Jr8. and many U. S. Supreme Court Justices9 have championed the spirit of the law, condemning those who sought to wrap their unjust actions in the minutiae or 'letter' of the law.

I demand that the NRC re-embrace the spirit of the laws that brought it into existence. I insist they wait to give Exelon this Early Site Permit until everyone in this country knows if there is a truly viable way to handle radioactive waste. I insist they go beyond their own regulations, which are minimum standards after all10, and deny an ESP until Exelon reveals what kind of a reactor it intends to build on Clinton Lake. I call for Exelon to pay for Clinton School District shortfalls, caused by the devaluation of the first reactor, as a demonstration of good faith to this community that Exelon is promising to enrich with a second reactor. I cry out along with many other scientists and activists that the time has come for the reactor staff and NRC to release for independent scientific scrutiny the radiation emission data they have been gathering for 30 years or more. And I insist that the NRC and Exelon fund independent, extensive,

epidemiological studies of Illinois populations that are in part designed by those critical of current radiation emission standards.

If the NRC wants me to retract my characterization of this process as a sham, then I want some proof that it is taking criticism of its process seriously. The NRC must become a watchdog, not a lapdog of the nuclear industry.

And if there are still people of conscience working at the NRC, I offer this final quote for their consideration, "The hope of a secure and livable world lies with disciplined nonconformists who are dedicated to justice, peace and brotherhood." (Martin Luther King, Jr.)

Endnotes

1This comment was made by NRC moderator, Chip Cameron, at an NRC meeting in Clinton in April, 2003.

2The lack of what might be called critical thinking evinced by W. R. Hendee and F. M Edwards' Health Effects of Exposure to Low-Level Ionizing Radiation (Bristol and Philadelphia: Institute of Physics Publishing, 1996), and John R. Lamarsh and Anthony J. Baratta's Introduction to Nuclear Engineering, Third Edition (Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001) is staggering. All concerns about nuclear energy's deleterious effects on health are dismissed as emotional rants by those who are not rational enough to see how beneficial nuclear energy could be. All issues surrounding waste storage are dismissed with equal ease.

3Here I am referring to Alice Stewart, Ernest Sternglass, John Goffman, Chris Busby, Jay Gould, Rosalie Bertell, and the many other scientists whose studies and books raise countless questions about nuclear energy's effects on humans, animals, plants and the larger ecosystems in which they exist.

4The NRC banner on their home page reads, "Protecting public health and safety through regulation of nuclear power and the civilian use of nuclear materials." (http://www.nrc.gov)

5"Most of the nuclear energy's real problem situations would tend to support the proposition that, if anything, the NRC process of nuclear surveillance has been too lax rather than too stringent . . . the U.S. has licensed and made large financial commitments to too many plants too quickly." (Former NRC Commissioner Peter A. Bradford testifying to Congress in 1983). I would add here that ex-Commissioner Bradford's comments are just as apropos today, when the so-called nuclear energy consortia are creating ever-longer lists of proposed sites for new U.S. reactors, even as the NRC plays the encouraging partner to their efforts.

6For example, the NRC likes to cite the National Cancer Institute study that supposedly found citizens living near nuclear reactors were suffering no ill health effects. It has been pointed out by Sternglass and others that the NCI study managed to bury nuclear reactor's negative health effects on surrounding populations by examining

populations living within a 50 mile radius of the plants, thereby diluting the negative effects suffered by those citizens who live in counties downwind or down-river from the reactors.

7Dr. Samuel Galewsky and Joe Mangano examined State of Illinois Health Department (IPLAN) data on infant mortality from 1996 to 1998 for the Clinton reactor downwind populations. They found statistically significant decreases in infant mortality rates for counties downwind (due east) of the Clinton plant for those years when the Clinton reactor was shut down due to safety problems. The infant mortality rates climbed upward once more when the Clinton plant went back on-line. And this pattern is not a Clinton anomaly; Jay Gould describes similar patterns in his book Deadly Deceit. Reactors whose troubled safety records meant they were shut down for two years or more provide the statistical opportunities for Gould to examine changes in health trends for populations living downwind of the reactors. If the Clinton numbers were the only ones showing this disturbing trend, they might be considered a fluke. However, when multiple reactors are showing similar trends, it is infuriating that the NRC does not see these patterns as red flags that warrant further epidemiological study.

8 Don't they understand that when I say the law must be challenged, I'm doing it always in the spirit of the law? I'm doing it always on the assumption that we must have law. But we must challenge law to be what law ought to be." (Martin Luther King, "Letter from Birmingham Jail").

9See Chief Justice Warren's opinion in Loving Et Ux. v. Virginia, Supreme Court of the United States, 388 U.S. 1. Also note the Supreme Court majority opinion in Lawrence v. Texas.

10Perhaps the NRC should read, "A Time for Courage. A Time to Act. Let the Real Corporate Leaders Step Up", prepared by the Council of Public Relations Firms (http://www.prfirms.org/resources/research/courage.asp). Beginning by reminding readers of the murky maneuvers of Enron, the CPRF goes on to exhort corporations to observe the spirit of the law rather than the letter of the laws and regulations that seek to govern their activities--if they hope to restore "investor confidence and public trust in American business and its leaders."

CC: <clinton@lists.nonewnukes.org>

Mail Envelope Properties (4293FB16.72C : 0 : 18220)

Subject: Statement on Clinton Draft EIS
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:11 AM
From: Professor Sandra Lindberg <slindber@iwu.edu>

Created By: slindber@iwu.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

lists.nonewnukes.org
clinton CC

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov
	lists.nonewnukes.org

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	10615	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 12:11 AM
19 Endnotes	11982	
19 3-min. #2	8779	
Mime.822	40932	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

NRC Regulations and Licensing Process Hopelessly Flawed:

EIS Not Accurate Way to Judge Site Suitability for Second Reactor in Clinton

Prepared by Sandra Lindberg
2009 E. Taylor St.
Bloomington, IL 61701
309-664-0403

Two years ago the NRC and Exelon first announced the possibility of a second reactor in Clinton. I asked at a meeting like this one how many protesters and how much critical information would be needed to stop this project. I was told that it didn't matter if there was one protester or 1,000, the reactor would be built as long as the NRC could prove it was following federal regulations in the site approval and licensing process.[1]

Two years have gone by. I've read and studied nuclear engineering textbooks mostly intent on prolonging a beleaguered industry.[2] I've also found the scientists, physicians and epidemiologists not on the nuclear industry payroll, whose research I find more convincing.[3] The experts in this room don't appeal to me much. Nor does this sham of a process. And here's the 'core' of my complaint.

On the NRC's website[4] they proclaim their statement of purpose: they exist to safeguard the health and safety of U.S. citizens. In fact, the NRC was created to end the abuse of its predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission, which became a cheerleader for the civilian reactor, rather than its watchdog. The spirit with which the NRC was created was a good one--it was supposed to put citizen interests first, though it's always had trouble sticking to this assignment. In the 1970's, for example, ex-commissioners of the NRC were

testifying at congressional hearings about the NRC's rush to license new plants regardless of safety concerns being raised about them.[5]

Unfortunately, the NRC has a bad habit of forgetting why it was created. It's become a letter-of-the-law commission. Current NRC regulations are written to favor the nuclear industry, not U.S. citizens. For example, the Early Site Permit process is not supposed to examine radioactive waste issues or reactor design. The NRC also refuses to analyze studies that challenge existing radiation standards, instead trotting out its favorite pro-nuke studies without examining new data in a substantive way.[6] These regulations stymie the NRC's ability to fulfill its mandate. Approving generic designs and what it calls the "plant parameter envelope" does not protect the people in this room, no matter what trappings the NRC uses to dress up its opinions.

This new reactor in Clinton, by necessity will include the equivalent of a waste dump. How can the NRC evaluate the site without researching how Exelon plans to handle its waste?

This new reactor may or may not include a containment building for its radioactive core. How can the NRC evaluate the site's suitability without knowing what kind of a reactor Exelon intends?

A study of populations downwind of the Clinton reactor, as well as similar studies of

people living downwind of eight other reactors, strongly suggest that current radiation emission standards are unsafe.[7] How does the NRC protect us when it dismisses critical studies by quibbling about sample size or by citing a flawed study by the National Cancer Institute that concludes there is no danger for citizens who live near nuclear reactors? How many infants are to die, and how many people are to contract cancer before the NRC decides the incidence numbers are high enough to warrant further study?

The NRC's slavish adherence to its carefully engineered regulations flies in the face of its own mission statement.

A couple thousand years ago the notion of the importance of a law's spirit emerged out of the Middle East. There, a very brave Jew dared to break holy laws; he healed a man on the Sabbath. When he was criticized, he replied that he was observing the spirit of the holy laws. That idea has wound its way into western culture--for the good, I believe. Martin Luther King, Jr[8]. and many U. S. Supreme Court Justices[9] have championed the spirit of the law, condemning those who sought to wrap their unjust actions in the minutiae or 'letter' of the law.

I demand that the NRC re-embrace the spirit of the laws that brought it into existence. I insist they wait to give Exelon this Early Site Permit until everyone in this country knows if there is a truly viable way to handle radioactive waste. I insist they go beyond their own regulations, which are minimum standards after all[10], and deny an ESP until Exelon

reveals what kind of a reactor it intends to build on Clinton Lake. I call for Exelon to pay for Clinton School District shortfalls, caused by the devaluation of the first reactor, as a demonstration of good faith to this community that Exelon is promising to enrich with a second reactor. I cry out along with many other scientists and activists that the time has come for the reactor staff and NRC to release for independent scientific scrutiny the radiation emission data they have been gathering for 30 years or more. And I insist that the NRC and Exelon fund independent, extensive, epidemiological studies of Illinois populations that are in part designed by those critical of current radiation emission standards.

If the NRC wants me to retract my characterization of this process as a sham, then I want some proof that it is taking criticism of its process seriously. The NRC must become a watchdog, not a lapdog of the nuclear industry.

And if there are still people of conscience working at the NRC, I offer this final quote for their consideration, "The hope of a secure and livable world lies with disciplined nonconformists who are dedicated to justice, peace and brotherhood." (Martin Luther King, Jr.)

Endnotes

[1]This comment was made by NRC moderator, Chip Cameron, at an NRC meeting in Clinton in April, 2003.

[2]The lack of what might be called critical thinking evinced by W. R. Hendee and F. M Edwards' Health Effects of Exposure to Low-Level Ionizing Radiation (Bristol and Philadelphia: Institute of Physics Publishing, 1996), and John R. Lamarsh and Anthony J. Baratta's Introduction to Nuclear Engineering, Third Edition (Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001) is staggering. All concerns about nuclear energy's deleterious effects on health are dismissed as emotional rants by those who are not rational enough to see how beneficial nuclear energy could be. All issues surrounding waste storage are dismissed with equal ease.

[3]Here I am referring to Alice Stewart, Ernest Sternglass, John Goffman, Chris Busby, Jay Gould, Rosalie Bertell, and the many other scientists whose studies and books raise countless questions about nuclear energy's effects on humans, animals, plants and the larger ecosystems in which they exist.

[4]The NRC banner on their home page reads, "Protecting public health and safety through regulation of nuclear power and the civilian use of nuclear materials." (http://www.nrc.gov)

[5]"Most of the nuclear energy's real problem situations would tend to support the proposition that, if anything, the NRC process of nuclear surveillance has been too lax rather than too stringent . . . the U.S. has licensed and made large financial commitments to too many plants too quickly." (Former NRC Commissioner Peter A. Bradford testifying to Congress in 1983). I would add here that ex-Commissioner Bradford's comments are just as apropos today, when the so-called nuclear energy consortia are creating ever-longer lists of proposed sites for new U.S. reactors, even as the NRC plays the encouraging partner to their efforts.

[6]For example, the NRC likes to cite the National Cancer Institute study that supposedly found citizens living near nuclear reactors were suffering no ill health effects. It has been pointed out by Sternglass and others that the NCI study managed to bury nuclear reactor's negative health effects on surrounding populations by examining populations living within a 50 mile radius of the plants, thereby diluting the negative effects suffered by those citizens who live in counties downwind or down-river from the reactors.

[7]Dr. Samuel Galewsky and Joe Mangano examined State of Illinois Health Department (IPLAN) data on infant mortality from 1996 to 1998 for the Clinton reactor downwind populations. They found statistically significant decreases in infant mortality rates for counties downwind (due east) of the Clinton plant for those years when the Clinton reactor was shut down due to safety problems. The infant mortality rates climbed upward once more when the Clinton plant went back on-line. And this pattern is not a Clinton

anomaly; Jay Gould describes similar patterns in his book Deadly Deceit. Reactors whose troubled safety records meant they were shut down for two years or more provide the statistical opportunities for Gould to examine changes in health trends for populations living downwind of the reactors. If the Clinton numbers were the only ones showing this disturbing trend, they might be considered a fluke. However, when multiple reactors are showing similar trends, it is infuriating that the NRC does not see these patterns as red flags that warrant further epidemiological study.

[8] Don't they understand that when I say the law must be challenged, I'm doing it always in the spirit of the law? I'm doing it always on the assumption that we must have law. But we must challenge law to be what law ought to be." (Martin Luther King, "Letter from Birmingham Jail").

[9]See Chief Justice Warren's opinion in Loving Et Ux. v. Virginia, Supreme Court of the United States, 388 U.S. 1. Also note the Supreme Court majority opinion in Lawrence v. Texas.

[10]Perhaps the NRC should read, "A Time for Courage. A Time to Act. Let the Real Corporate Leaders Step Up", prepared by the Council of Public Relations Firms (http://www.prfirms.org/resources/research/courage.asp). Beginning by reminding readers of the murky maneuvers of Enron, the CPRF goes on to exhort corporations to observe the spirit of the law rather than the letter of the laws and regulations that seek to govern their activities--if they hope to restore "investor confidence and public trust in American business and its leaders."

3/10/05

70FR 12022

(70)

DB Receipt

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

From: Jost <jost@shout.net>
To: <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:06 AM
Subject: Building Permit

To whom it may concern,

Due to safety concerns today and lack of effective long-term storage for waste tomorrow I would like to see the existing power plant at Clinton de-comissioned.
Instead of building another nuclear plant effort should be re-directed to developing large scale solar and wind sources.

Sincerely,

Scott Jost
Urbana, IL

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (4293F9B1.645 : 19 : 17989)

Subject: Building Permit
Creation Date: Wed, May 25, 2005 12:05 AM
From: Jost <jost@shout.net>

Created By: jost@shout.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	353	Wednesday, May 25, 2005 12:05 AM
Mime.822	1220	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Patricia Aguirre" <patriaciaaguirre@webtv.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 11:03 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Patricia Aguirre
4835 Buchanan St.
Los Angeles, CA 90042

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(71)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

RDB Received

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add - T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Patricia Aguirre

Mail Envelope Properties (4293EAF6.3B9 : 17 : 17337)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 11:02 PM
From: "Patricia Aguirre" <patriaciaaguirre@webtv.net>

Created By: patriaciaaguirre@webtv.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5252	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 11:02 PM
Mime.822	6320	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Eric Bourgeois" <ebourg@gis.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 10:03 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Eric Bourgeois
888 Massachusetts avnue 614-A
Cambridge, MA 02139

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(72)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

RDB Received

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Eric Bourgeois

Mail Envelope Properties (4293DCD3.198 : 22 : 16792)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 10:02 PM
From: "Eric Bourgeois" <ebourg@gis.net>

Created By: ebourg@gis.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5258	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 10:02 PM
Mime.822	6312	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "William E Kowatch" <ajax952@hotmail.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 9:16 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

William E Kowatch
715 Farmers Avenue
Bellmore, NY 11710

3/10/05
70FR12022
(73)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP. Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

William E Kowatch

Mail Envelope Properties (4293D1E6.F93 : 5 : 16275)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 9:15 PM
From: "William E Kowatch" <ajax952@hotmail.com>

Created By: ajax952@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5252	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 9:15 PM
Mime.822	6314	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Faith Sadley" <fsadley@comcast.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 9:03 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Faith Sadley
3305 George St.
Thunderbolt, GA 31494

3/10/05
70FR12022
(74)

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

RPBrecent

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Faith Sadley

Mail Envelope Properties (4293CEFA.F03 : 11 : 16131)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 9:03 PM
From: "Faith Sadley" <fsadley@comcast.net>

Created By: fsadley@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5242	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 9:03 PM
Mime.822	6298	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Brent Barnes" <burntbeans@hotmail.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 8:49 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

RDB Received

Brent Barnes
408 W. Oregon St. #2
Urbana, IL 61801

3/10/05

70FR 12022

May 24, 2005

(75)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Brent Barnes

Mail Envelope Properties (4293CB95.E35 : 5 : 15925)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 8:48 PM
From: "Brent Barnes" <burntbeans@hotmail.com>

Created By: burntbeans@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5242	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 8:48 PM
Mime.822	6301	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "G Hande" <sfqmmom@aol.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:41 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

G Hande
45 Northrop Road
West haven, Ct 06516

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(76)

RTB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 3:00

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

G.Hande

Mail Envelope Properties (4293BBA7.AAD : 1 : 15021)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:41 PM
From: "G Hande" <sfqmmom@aol.com>

Created By: sfqmmom@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5232	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 7:41 PM
Mime.822	6279	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Jim & Virginia Wagner" <JimWagner@safe-mail.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:40 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Jim & Virginia Wagner
4897 E Walnut St
Westerville, OH 43081

8/10/05
70 FR 12022
(77)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:59

RDB Received

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

We write to you because the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete (for a variety of reasons).

First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors.

Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs.

These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power."

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind.

If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited

ESP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

in the DEIS.

An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether.

Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration.

No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets.

However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut.

Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest.

Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction.

If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors.

The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought.

This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake."

However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change.

This must be factored into the lake impact analysis.

It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as

habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years.

The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for.

Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS."

We urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering our comments; we do look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Jim & Virginia Wagner

Mail Envelope Properties (4293BB46.A8E : 20 : 14990)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:39 PM
From: "Jim & Virginia Wagner" <JimWagner@safe-mail.net>

Created By: JimWagner@safe-mail.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5319	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 7:39 PM
Mime.822	6418	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Elena Day" <elenaday@aol.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:30 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB receipt
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:59

Elena Day
151 Buckingham Circle
Charlottesville, VA 22903

3/10/05
70FR12022
(H8)

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Elena Day

Mail Envelope Properties (4293B917.9B7 : 5 : 14775)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:29 PM
From: "Elena Day" <elenaday@aol.com>

Created By: elenaday@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5246	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 7:29 PM
Mime.822	6296	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Mha Atma S Khalsa" <ean@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:29 PM
Subject: My comments: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Mha Atma S Khalsa
1536 Crest Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90035

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(79)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:59

RDB Received

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

As a concerned American citizen I thank you for considering my comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Mha Atma S. Khalsa

Mail Envelope Properties (4293B8BB.985 : 5 : 14725)

Subject: My comments: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 7:28 PM
From: "Mha Atma S Khalsa" <ean@sbcglobal.net>

Created By: ean@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5316	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 7:28 PM
Mime.822	6386	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Katy Nicholson" <katy@energyjustice.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 6:08 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Katy Nicholson
2344 Airport Road
Centerville, IN 47330

3/10/05

70FR 12022

(80)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:58

RDB Reader

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Katy Nicholson

Mail Envelope Properties (4293A5C2.485 : 0 : 13445)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 6:07 PM
From: "Katy Nicholson" <katy@energyjustice.net>

Created By: katy@energyjustice.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5248	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 6:07 PM
Mime.822	6308	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Robin Lorentzen" <rlorentzen@albertson.edu>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 4:15 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Robin Lorentzen
14250 Chicken Dinner Road
Caldwell, ID 83607

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(81)

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:58

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=M. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Dr. Robin Lorentzen
208-454-3250

Mail Envelope Properties (42938B39.96C : 9 : 10604)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 4:14 PM
From: "Robin Lorentzen" <rlorentzen@albertson.edu>

Created By: rlorentzen@albertson.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5272	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 4:14 PM
Mime.822	6338	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Mark E. Smith" <mymarkx@yahoo.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 4:04 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Mark E. Smith
1055 9th Ave #203
San Diego, CA 92101

3/10/05

70FR12022

(82)

RDB Receipt
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:57

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Smith
619-702-7251

Mail Envelope Properties (429388DE.867 : 23 : 10343)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 4:04 PM
From: "Mark E. Smith" <mymarkx@yahoo.com>

Created By: mymarkx@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5257	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 4:04 PM
Mime.822	6313	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Sarah Lanzman" <lanzbrod@cstone.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 3:19 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Sarah Lanzman
8907 Dick Woods Rd.
Afton, VA 22920

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(83)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:57

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SESP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Sarah Lanzman

Mail Envelope Properties (42937E51.139 : 10 : 8505)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 3:19 PM
From: "Sarah Lanzman" <lanzbrod@cstone.net>

Created By: lanzbrod@cstone.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5242	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 3:19 PM
Mime.822	6299	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Donald and Connie Roux" <c.roux@insightbb.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 3:15 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Donald and Connie Roux
407 Floral Park Drive
Savoy, IL 61874

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(84)

BDB Received

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:57

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Donald and Connie Roux
217-355-6506

Mail Envelope Properties (42937D2F.FF2 : 8 : 8178)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 3:14 PM
From: "Donald and Connie Roux" <c.roux@insightbb.com>

Created By: c.roux@insightbb.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5275	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 3:14 PM
Mime.822	6343	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Linda Zoblotsky" <lzoblotsky@yahoo.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 2:49 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Linda Zoblotsky
5300 keller springs rd
dallas, tx 75248

3/10/05

70FR12022

(85)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:57

RDB Received

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Linda Zoblotsky
972-726-7800

Mail Envelope Properties (42937720.C76 : 16 : 7286)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 2:48 PM
From: "Linda Zoblotsky" <lzoblotsky@yahoo.com>

Created By: lzoblotsky@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5263	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 2:48 PM
Mime.822	6323	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "John Lischalk" <jbchalk@comcast.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:30 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

John Lischalk
PO Box 3467
Silverdale, WA 98383

3/10/05
70FR 12022
(86)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:56

ADB Receipt

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

John M Lischalk

Mail Envelope Properties (429364C2.0CB : 4 : 4299)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:30 PM
From: "John Lischalk" <jbchalk@comcast.net>

Created By: jbchalk@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5241	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 1:30 PM
Mime.822	6298	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Beki Lischalk" <bekilynn@comcast.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:30 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Beki Lischalk
PO Box 3467
Silverdale, WA 98383

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:56

RDB Receipt

3/10/05

70FR12022

(87)

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Beki Lischalk

Mail Envelope Properties (429364A3.0C7 : 0 : 4295)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:30 PM
From: "Beki Lischalk" <bekilynn@comcast.net>

Created By: bekilynn@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5239	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 1:30 PM
Mime.822	6297	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Linda Ferris" <slundin4429@charter.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:27 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB Received

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:56

Linda Ferris
428 Town Hill Road
New Hartford, Ct 06057

3/10/05

70FR12022

(88)

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03

add=T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Linda Ferris

Mail Envelope Properties (429363FF.052 : 8 : 4178)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:26 PM
From: "Linda Ferris" <slundin4429@charter.net>

Created By: slundin4429@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5246	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 1:26 PM
Mime.822	6306	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Michael Laird" <mwlaird@yahoo.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:12 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Michael Laird
17 Stuyvesant Oval
New York, NY 10009

3/10/05

70FR 12022

(89)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:56

RDB received

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Michael Laird

Mail Envelope Properties (42936059.DB5 : 14 : 3509)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 1:11 PM
From: "Michael Laird" <mwlaird@yahoo.com>

Created By: mwlaird@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5244	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 1:11 PM
Mime.822	6299	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Susan Emge Milliner" <semgem@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:54 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Susan Emge Milliner
102 S. Kings Canyon Drive
Cedar Park, TX 78613

3/10/05

70FR12022

(90)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:56

RDB Receive

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Add=T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Susan Emge Milliner
512-336-0613

Mail Envelope Properties (42935C42.B07 : 3 : 2823)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:54 PM
From: "Susan Emge Milliner" <semgem@sbcglobal.net>

Created By: semgem@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5278	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:54 PM
Mime.822	6342	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Barbara Henderson" <barbara@onehellofashell.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:47 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:56

RDB Reference

Barbara Henderson
907 W. Branch Street
Lantana, fl 33462-4311

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(91)

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Barbara Henderson
561-582-5464

Mail Envelope Properties (42935A82.A1E : 20 : 2590)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:46 PM
From: "Barbara Henderson" <barbara@onehellofashell.com>

Created By: barbara@onehellofashell.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5271	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:46 PM
Mime.822	6341	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Sandra Blackburn" <sanderella01@hotmail.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:48 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB Receipt
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:56

Sandra Blackburn
346 N Sunset Ave Spc 141
La Puente, CA 91744

3/10/05
70FR12022
(92)

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Sandra Blackburn

Mail Envelope Properties (42935AE0.A51 : 21 : 2641)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:48 PM
From: "Sandra Blackburn" <sanderella01@hotmail.com>

Created By: sanderella01@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5257	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:48 PM
Mime.822	6322	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "William Brigman" <billbrigman@hotmail.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 7:42 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

William Brigman
431 OLD CHERAW HWY.
ROCKINGHAM, N. 28379

3/10/05

70FR 12022

(93)

NDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:53

May 26, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

William C. Brigman

Mail Envelope Properties (42965ED8.D76 : 4 : 11638)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 7:42 PM
From: "William Brigman" <billbrigman@hotmail.com>

Created By: billbrigman@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5254	Thursday, May 26, 2005 7:42 PM
Mime.822	6316	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Timothy Stebler" <timstebler@juno.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 8:51 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:53

Timothy Stebler
2834 Mark Cr.
Stillwater, Ok 74075

3/10/05

May 26, 2005

70FR 12022

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

94

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Template=ADM-013

Add=T. Kenyon (TJK)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Timothy L. Stebler

Mail Envelope Properties (42966F06.06B : 11 : 12395)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 8:51 PM
From: "Timothy Stebler" <timstebler@juno.com>

Created By: timstebler@juno.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5248	Thursday, May 26, 2005 8:51 PM
Mime.822	6307	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:5

From: "Joe Salazar" <houseofsavoy2003@netscape.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 9:42 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Joe Salazar
610 Cherrywood Dr.
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

3/10/05

May 26, 2005

70 FR 12022

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

95

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Joe Salazar

Mail Envelope Properties (42967AF6.285 : 24 : 12933)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 9:41 PM
From: "Joe Salazar" <houseofsavoy2003@netscape.net>

Created By: houseofsavoy2003@netscape.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5242	Thursday, May 26, 2005 9:41 PM
Mime.822	6308	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Received

From: "jeanne thatcher " <chicocreek@sunset.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, May 27, 2005 1:46 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:52

jeanne thatcher
300 legion ave.
chico, ca 95926

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(96)

May 27, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete -

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

jeanne Thatcher
530-342-9249

Mail Envelope Properties (4296B43F.D2E : 3 : 15662)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Fri, May 27, 2005 1:46 AM
From: "jeanne thatcher " <chicocreek@sunset.net>

Created By: chicocreek@sunset.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5256	Friday, May 27, 2005 1:46 AM
Mime.822	6318	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Walter Ballin" <wallyjballin@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, May 27, 2005 2:02 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:52

Walter Ballin
251 Rio Lindo Ave. #7
Chico, CA 95926

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

May 27, 2005

(97)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

ESP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Add=T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Walter Ballin

Mail Envelope Properties (4296B805.D9A : 11 : 15770)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Fri, May 27, 2005 2:02 AM
From: "Walter Ballin" <wallyjballin@sbcglobal.net>

Created By: wallyjballin@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5244	Friday, May 27, 2005 2:02 AM
Mime.822	6307	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Clark Mleynek" <mleynek@kc.rr.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, May 28, 2005 8:55 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Clark Mleynek
2013 West 47th Terrace
Westwood, KS 66205

3/10/05

May 28, 2005

70FR 12022

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

98

RDB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:52

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Clark Mleynek

Mail Envelope Properties (42986A33.F13 : 14 : 40723)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Sat, May 28, 2005 8:54 AM
From: "Clark Mleynek" <mleynek@kc.rr.com>

Created By: mleynek@kc.rr.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5248	Saturday, May 28, 2005 8:54 AM
Mime.822	6302	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Marguerite Joan Galimitakis" <ctsilverstreak@earthlink.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, May 27, 2005 10:44 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Marguerite Joan Galimitakis
4 Fieldbrook Ave
Clinton, CT 06413

3/10/05
70FR12022
(99)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:52

RDBrown

May 27, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development…[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Marguerite Joan Galimitakis
860-669-0879

Mail Envelope Properties (4297DAFF.EBA : 4 : 36538)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Fri, May 27, 2005 10:44 PM
From: "Marguerite Joan Galimitakis" <ctsilverstreak@earthlink.net>

Created By: ctsilverstreak@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5290	Friday, May 27, 2005 10:44 PM
Mime.822	6372	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Lydia Garvey" <wolfhowlmama@yahoo.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, May 28, 2005 12:05 AM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Lydia Garvey
429 S 24th st
Clinton, OK 73601

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(100)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:52

RDB Received

May 28, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development…[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Lydia Garvey
580-323-2327

Mail Envelope Properties (4297EDE5.0B4 : 10 : 37044)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Sat, May 28, 2005 12:04 AM
From: "Lydia Garvey" <wolfhowlmama@yahoo.com>

Created By: wolfhowlmama@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5252	Saturday, May 28, 2005 12:04 AM
Mime.822	6315	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "David and Jennifer Nolfi" <davidnolfi@hotmail.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, May 30, 2005 12:24 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

David and Jennifer Nolfi
6119 SW Corbett Avenue
Portland, OR 97239-3601

3/10/05
70FR 12022
(101)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:52

May 30, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS= ADM-03

Add= T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

David and Jennifer Nolfi
503-244-4182

Mail Envelope Properties (429B3E45.770 : 14 : 59248)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Mon, May 30, 2005 12:24 PM
From: "David and Jennifer Nolfi" <davidnolfi@hotmail.com>

Created By: davidnolfi@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5288	Monday, May 30, 2005 12:24 PM
Mime.822	6360	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "James Scurrah" <vlggrn@charter.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2005 7:42 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:51

James Scurrah
P.O. Box 395
Hollis, nh 03049

3/10/05

70FR 12022

102

June 1, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFS & Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Template = ADM-013

Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

James Scurrah
603-465-3732

Mail Envelope Properties (429E47D1.79D : 20 : 59293)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2005 7:41 PM
From: "James Scurrah" <vlggrn@charter.net>

Created By: vlggrn@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5249	Wednesday, June 1, 2005 7:41 PM
Mime.822	6304	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

3/10/05

70FR 12022

(103)

From: Wally Taylor <Walter.Taylor@Honeywell.com>
To: <infocollects@nrc.gov>
Date: 5/26/05 3:10PM
Subject: Response from "Comment on NRC Documents"

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by

Wally Taylor (Walter.Taylor@Honeywell.com) on Thursday, May 26, 2005 at 15:10:11

Document_Title: nureg 1815

Comments: Question. On page 6-4 line 25 it seems to state that this reactor will have an effluent of 400,000 curies per year of Kr-85.

I thought Kr-85 was a fission product and that it was captured in the fuel rod, not released as an effluent. Am I reading this right??

Wally Taylor

organization: Concerned and knowledgeable individual

address1: 105 Riss Drive

address2:

city: Normal

state: IL

zip: 61761

country: USA

phone: 309-888-9616

RDB received

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:54

E-RIDS= ADM-03

Add= T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SFSP Review Complete

Template= ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42961F29.5D8 : 8 : 5592)

Subject:	Response from "Comment on NRC Documents"
Creation Date:	5/26/05 3:10PM
From:	Wally Taylor <Walter.Taylor@Honeywell.com>
Created By:	Walter.Taylor@Honeywell.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
INFOCOLLECTS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	782	05/26/05 03:10PM
Mime.822	1500	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

104

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:54

RDB received

From: Joyce Blumenshine <joblumen@yahoo.com>
To: <infocollects@nrc.gov>
Date: 5/26/05 1:06AM
Subject: Response from "Comment on NRC Documents"

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by

Joyce Blumenshine (joblumen@yahoo.com) on Thursday, May 26, 2005 at 01:05:58

Document_Title: Clinton Exelon Nuclear Reactor Early Site Permit

Comments: Comment in Oposition to the Clinton Exelon Nuclear Reactor
Early Site Permit

Heart of Illinois Sierra Club, representing its 900 members within central Illinois, is opposed to the Early Site Permit
for the proposed second reactor at the Exelon Clinton site.
Concerns for groundwater safety, costs to the public both ratepayers and taxpayers, inadequate storage for radioactive waste at the site, and the fact that wind energy and other sources of sustainable and safe energy are being developed should take precidence for Illinois.
Joyce Blumenshine
Board Member
Heart of Illinois Sierra Club
P.O. Box 3419
Peoria, IL 61614

organization: Heart of Illinois Sierra Club

address1: P.O. Box 3419

address2:

city: Peoria

state: IL

zip: 61614

country: US

phone: 309-688-0950

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Mail Envelope Properties (42955943.694 : 16 : 50836)

Subject: Response from "Comment on NRC Documents"
Creation Date: 5/26/05 1:05AM
From: Joyce Blumenshine <joblumen@yahoo.com>

Created By: joblumen@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
INFOCOLLECTS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1153	05/26/05 01:05AM
Mime.822	1876	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "richard linsenberg" <ral1124@hotmail.com>
To: "Clinton Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 10:32 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement foran Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

richard linsenberg
1901 walnut st
phila, pa 19103

3/10/05
70FR12022
105

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:54

RDB Received

May 24, 2005

Clinton Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Clinton Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Add=T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

richard linsenberg

Mail Envelope Properties (42933AD9.56D : 23 : 62829)

Subject:	Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement foran Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site
Creation Date:	Tue, May 24, 2005 10:31 AM
From:	"richard linsenberg" <ral1124@hotmail.com>
Created By:	ral1124@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	**Route**
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5202	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 10:31 AM
Mime.822	6337	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Smoky Mountain" <smountain@convio.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 3:55 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

ADB Received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:54

Smoky Mountain
207 Reveille Rd
Austin, TX 78746

3/10/05

70FR 12022

106

May 26, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Smoky Mountain

Mail Envelope Properties (429629C1.B25 : 15 : 6949)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Thu, May 26, 2005 3:55 PM
From: "Smoky Mountain" <smountain@convio.com>

Created By: smountain@convio.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5241	Thursday, May 26, 2005 3:55 PM
Mime.822	6297	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Tammie Haugen" <bkranig@mn.rr.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:17 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB Rec'd
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:55

Tammie Haugen
10007 Emerson
Bloomington, mn 55431

3/10/05
70FR 12022
107

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Tammie Haugen
952-881-1293

Mail Envelope Properties (429353A0.5D7 : 0 : 1495)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:17 PM
From: "Tammie Haugen" <bkranig@mn.rr.com>

Created By: bkranig@mn.rr.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5255	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:17 PM
Mime.822	6311	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Christine Roane" <cmroane@cool-universe.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:18 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:55

RDB Rec'd

Christine Roane
120 Mooreland Street
Springfield, MA 01104

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
108

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Christine M. Roane
413-733-3045

Mail Envelope Properties (429353C1.5E8 : 17 : 1512)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:17 PM
From: "Christine Roane" <cmroane@cool-universe.com>

Created By: cmroane@cool-universe.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5269	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:17 PM
Mime.822	6336	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Barbara Fike" <BFike4@chartermi.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:30 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Barbara Fike
4380 Dexter-Pinckney Road
Dexter, MI 48130

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
109

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:55

ADB Receipt

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SFSP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Template = ADM-013

Cc = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Barbara Fike
734-426-4832

Mail Envelope Properties (429356A3.785 : 5 : 1925)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:29 PM
From: "Barbara Fike" <BFike4@chartermi.net>

Created By: BFike4@chartermi.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5260	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:29 PM
Mime.822	6319	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski" <cherylruth2@hotmail.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:31 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

RDB Recvd
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:55

Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski
43280 Polo Circle
Sterling Heights, MI 48313

3/10/05
70 FR 12022

May 24, 2005

110

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

YOU KNOW VERY WELL that the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less DANGEROUS energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to EIGHT TIMES its current electricity needs through RENEWABLE sources; WE INSIST NRC examine UCS's methodology and modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

Other important factors, such as WASTE, are IGNORED ALTOGETHER! Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, WASTE CONCERNS must be taken into consideration. NO analysis of whether the site is SUITABLE for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also FAILS to consider the SECURITY implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered PRIME TERRORIST TARGETS. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a TREMENDOUS CONFLICT of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski
586-247-6929

Mail Envelope Properties (429356C5.7B1 : 24 : 1969)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:30 PM
From: "Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski" <cherylruth2@hotmail.com>

Created By: cherylruth2@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5549	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:30 PM
Mime.822	6627	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "H. Elaine Engel" <elaine@asisna.com>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:46 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

H. Elaine Engel
2229 N6th St. Apt. 100
Cheney, Wa 99004

3/10/05

70 FR 12022

(111)

RDB received
2005 JUN -6 PM 2:55

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = T. Kenyon (TJK2)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

H. Elaine Engel
509 559 5311

Mail Envelope Properties (42935A63.A0C : 2 : 2572)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:46 PM
From: "H. Elaine Engel" <elaine@asisna.com>

Created By: elaine@asisna.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5263	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:46 PM
Mime.822	6321	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

From: "Dean Foss" <agate@iowatelecom.net>
To: "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <ClintonEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:46 PM
Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022

Dean Foss
104 East Green Street
Mount Pleasant, IA 52641

3/10/05
70 FR 12022
(112)

2005 JUN -6 PM 2:55

RDB received

May 24, 2005

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Comments on NUREG-1815, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the Exelon ESP Site

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Exelon's Early Site Permit (ESP) application is incomplete for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids consideration of important siting factors. Specifically, the need for power in the central Illinois region was not examined, nor did NRC do a proper analysis of the ability of a combination of renewable energy technologies to meet any power needs. These issues will supposedly be dealt with at a later permitting stage, but they are more properly examined early in the siting process.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found NRC's approach flawed, claiming that "since it ignores the justification for the power plant addition in the early stage of project development...[it] biases the subsequent energy alternative analysis toward nuclear power." According to the U.S. Department of Energy, Illinois already exports approximately 18% of the electricity generated in the state; additional generating capacity is unwarranted.

As for alternatives, it is unacceptable to allow Exelon to define the project goals so narrowly that only nuclear power can achieve them; for instance, requiring that any alternative be constructed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed ESP site and provide baseload power unfairly precludes consideration of less polluting and less dangerous energy sources such as wind. If sufficiently distributed geographically, and combined with other forms of renewable energy generating technologies and conservation/ efficiency measures, there are economic alternatives to nuclear power that can meet our energy needs without falling victim to the intermittency problem cited in the DEIS. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists found that Illinois has the technical potential to generate up to eight times its current electricity needs through renewable sources; NRC should examine UCS's methodology and perhaps modify its conclusion that renewable energy resources are incapable of providing reliable power.

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Kenyon (TSK2)

Template = ADM-013

Other important factors, such as waste, are ignored altogether. Given that the proposed Yucca Mountain repository is a long way from ever opening, and that even if it does it will not have the capacity to accept waste from a new reactor at Clinton, waste concerns must be taken into consideration. No analysis of whether the site is suitable for indefinite storage of high-level waste is included in the DEIS.

NRC also fails to consider the security implications of expanding the Clinton nuclear site. It is well known that nuclear plants are considered prime terrorist targets. However, the Clinton plant, like all Exelon-owned plants, is guarded by the private security firm Wackenhut. Wackenhut also has a contract to test security at all the country's nuclear plants, posing a tremendous conflict of interest. Without an unbiased system for testing security, the actual level of preparation by guards is unknowable, and this gap in our knowledge should be enough to preclude further reactor construction. If the NRC will not remove Wackenhut from testing duty, it should take this conflict of interest-and the security questions it raises-into account.

The DEIS is also incomplete in its analysis of the effects a new reactor will have on Clinton Lake, the only source of cooling water for the existing and proposed reactors. The DEIS does note that "the consumptive water loss to the atmosphere from the cooling tower of a new nuclear unit could lower the water levels of the lake significantly during times of drought. This could impact both boating (lower water levels) and fishing (lower water levels and elevated temperatures) at the lake." However, it fails to note that drought conditions in the Midwest are predicted to become more prevalent in coming decades due to climate change. This must be factored into the lake impact analysis. It is also unacceptable that the new reactor's effect on lake temperature remains undetermined; temperature has a direct impact on water levels, enjoyment of the lake for recreational purposes, and its acceptability as habitat for various animal species. This should be rectified before granting the ESP.

Finally, NRC should reconsider the validity of its EIS in the context of its decision to grant an ESP valid for twenty years. The EPA noted in recent comments that "the twenty year horizon allotted under the proposed ESP does not have any protective assurance that unforeseen population growth and/or additional stressor on the Air or Water resources will be accounted for. Typically an action that has not occurred within three years of an EIS requires at minimum a supplemental EIS." I urge NRC to take EPA's advice.

Thank you for considering these comments; I look forward to your substantive response.

Sincerely,

Dean Foss

Mail Envelope Properties (42935A1F.980 : 12 : 2432)

Subject: Re: Federal Register: March 10, 2005, Page 12022
Creation Date: Tue, May 24, 2005 12:44 PM
From: "Dean Foss" <agate@iowatelecom.net>

Created By: agate@iowatelecom.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
ClintonEIS

Post Office	Route
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5245	Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:44 PM
Mime.822	6300	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ADB licensee

407 Floral Park Drive
Savoy, IL 61874 2005 JUN -7 AM 9:03
May 29, 2005

3/10/05
70FR 12022

(113)

Mr. Michael T. Lesar
Chief Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop T-6D59
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Re: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for and Early Site Permit (ESP) at Exelon's ESP Site at the Clinton Power Station (NUREG-1815)

Dear Mr. Lesar,

It is our view that building more nuclear reactors at the existing Clinton site poses far more risks than benefits to Illinois residents. An early site permit for the reactors there should be denied.

Illinois-based Exelon has applied for a site permit, which would allow the company to "bank" the site for 20 years, during which time it can choose a reactor type and apply for a combined construction and operating license.

A new reactor in Clinton is unnecessary, unsafe and expensive. Nuclear power is not a good deal for the residents of Clinton , Illinois, or America.

1) One pressing issue is how the additional nuclear capacity would affect the health and vitality of Clinton Lake. The Clinton nuclear reactor relies on water from the lake to cool it, but additional generation capacity would require more water and may overtax and deplete the lake, especially in drought years when water levels are low. Such overuse may force the plant to shut down, since the loss of coolant is a serious safety problem that could lead to meltdown, and could make the lake less desirable as a source of recreation due to high water temperatures. The precise impact is unclear, since neither Exelon nor NRC has done a full analysis of how a new reactor would affect the lake temperature.

This environmental review which was done, is notable for what it doesn't address. It seems that the early site permit process is designed to give the *appearance* that important problems are being considered and resolved, when the difficult questions are simply postponed or ignored altogether.

2) The NRC's environmental impact statement also fails to evaluate the security threat of

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Add=T. Kenyon (TJK2)

indefinitely storing onsite the additional nuclear waste that would be generated by the proposed new nuclear unit. Another nuclear reactor at Clinton could create 20 to 30 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste, annually. To date, there is no feasible solution to safely and permanently dispose of this waste, which must cool onsite for five years before it can be moved. Moreover, the environmental impact statement does not adequately consider the possibility and consequences of severe accident scenarios resulting from the transportation of spent nuclear fuel.

3) NRC regulations do require consideration of the **need** for the plant, and a detailed consideration of need is absent from the agency's impact statement.

4) Federal law does require a consideration of alternative energy sources, but the NRC's review dismisses renewable energy as an alternative source of power, saying that such sources are not "environmentally preferable" to nuclear power, despite acknowledging that Illinois has the untapped potential to produce as much electricity from wind as from nine additional nuclear reactors.

5) These early site permits are costing taxpayers millions of dollars because the government has subsidized the process to encourage big energy companies to invest in nuclear power. We should be investing in renewable and energy-efficient technologies, not 20th century technologies that suffer from the same fatal flaws now as they have for the past 50 years."

Taxpayers foot half the bill for license applications, yet Exelon is not a very good corporate citizen in return. Because it has taken advantage of new electricity deregulation rules, its property tax payments have declined from 80 percent of DeWitt County's total property tax revenue in 1996 to 53 percent in 2002. This resulted in an annual revenue loss of $8.8 million to the county; local officials report that their economy has "reached bottom," and Clinton School District 15 has been forced to cut its budget by $3 million and spend reserves over the past several years.

For all of the above reasons, an Early Site Permit for the Clinton, Illinois reactor should be **emphatically denied.**

Sincerely,

Connie Roux

Donald Roux

Connie and Donald Roux
Illinois Citizens