UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

2/14/08
73FR 8719
(1)

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

2008 MAR 21 PM 4:40

RECEIVED

E-RFDS = ADM-03
Add =
T. L. Frederichs (TLF)
L. Quinn (LHQ1)

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

19 Woodland Way
Greenbelt MD 20770
March 8, 2008

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555

To whom it may concern:

In carrying out the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process related to Constellation Energy/Unistar's proposed Calvert Cliffs-3 reactor, please consider alternatives to building the reactor and please look carefully and impartially at the problems entailed in dealing with radioactive waste.

I think there are many reasons why this new reactor should not be built. One of these reasons is the cost. Constellation Energy says they expect it to cost around 4-5 billion dollars, but other estimates have ranged all the way up to a possible 12 billion. Then there's the cost of decommissioning it after the relatively short lifetime of a nuclear reactor. As a taxpayer + a buyer of power in the state of Maryland, I know that portions of this cost will end up coming out of my pocket, and I protest strongly.

A second, more important, reason is that we still do not have good ways to deal with the radioactive material that nuclear power produces. I do not believe there is any good way to store it, yet we keep on producing it, poisoning the earth that we will pass on to future generations. I hope your process includes careful inspection of the dry cask irradiated fuel storage units at Calvert Cliffs as well as the problems involved in transporting this waste to another site. Have the casks degraded over time? How could such dangerous material be transported safely, avoiding densely populated areas — which is where our rail lines + highways go — without risk to the eco-system of the Chesapeake Bay or the human population of the area?

Then, there is the danger of radioactivity being spread

(over)

by an accident or a terrorist attack. We should be phasing out our use of nuclear power, not building more easy targets.

I hope the E.I.S. will include in-depth consideration of alternatives to Calvert Cliffs-3. The area's power needs can be met by safer and more environmentally friendly means: through using renewable energy sources and by developing energy efficiency programs.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Marjory M. Donn

Marjory M. Donn