

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Paul Kallan
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2008 4:06 PM
To: Ronnie Gorham
Subject: FW: Comments on scoping of the EIS for STP units 3 and 4

Importance: High

Hi Ronnie,

Can you just put in the Cameron Payne e-mail in Adams. I thank you for all your help.

Paul :-)

From: ^PNNL NRC South Texas Comments [mailto:NRCSouthTexasComments@pnl.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2008 3:48 PM
To: Paul Kallan
Subject: FW: Comments on scoping of the EIS for STP units 3 and 4
Importance: High

This a the copy of Cameron Payne's email that was sent to me. I did an ADAMS search for him and only came up with the transcript and your scoping meeting summary, but not this email. So I am guessing it never was submitted.

Nona

From: Cameron Payne at ATT.net [mailto:campayne@att.net]
Sent: Monday, February 18, 2008 8:59 PM
To: STP_COL@nrc.gov
Subject: Comments on scoping of the EIS for STP units 3 and 4
Importance: High

February 18, 2008

Re:STP reactors #3 and #4 Environmental Impact Statement

Dear NRC:

At the meeting held by the NRC in Bay City, TX on February 5, 2008, I was called to speak by Mr. F. Cameron to address the assembly. I did so briefly, addressing mainly my concerns:

1. Whether the NRC-certified GE ABWR design is the same as what STPNOC and its owners (hereinafter called "STP") wish to build, given the large numbers of changes, variations, and exemptions (some of which are substantial and significant) from the certified STPNOC has requested. I am also concerned that the designer of record is now Toshiba, and not GE/Hitachi.
2. Although no ABWR has ever been built in the U.S., two of the four extant ABWR reactors, designed to be earthquake-proof in Japan were damaged in the July 26, 2007 earthquake. Reactor control and fuel rods were stuck in both units #6 and # 7, both ABWR reactors. Fortunately, these two reactors were located where they were and not where reactors 1, 2,

3 and 4 were located, an area that received even greater seismic acceleration. In Unit 7, the boiler for maintaining the vacuum in the condenser stopped because of the earthquake. Cooling had to be maintained using the main steam safety release valve. Manual operation was necessary because of the continuing aftershocks, so it must have been a fairly hair-raising experience for the operators. Radioactive water from the spent fuel pool of Unit 6 leaked to the sea. Iodine leaked from the exhaust stack of Unit 7 along with chromium 51 and cobalt 60. Piping from the fire protection system ruptured. An in-house transformer caught on fire and burned for two hours (unit 3). Damage to the ceiling crane on the operating floor of the reactor building (Unit 6).

These facts hardly lend confidence to the ABWR design proposed by STP.

In addition, I hereby submit two other issues for consideration under the EIS:

3. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require that *plausible* statements as to the prospective environmental impacts be disclosed in advance. Any Environmental Impact Statement that did not raise the twin specters of nuclear core meltdown and a meltdown in a spent nuclear fuel pool is inadequate, and should be challenged in court.

I live near the center of Houston, Texas which is about 70 miles from the existing two STP nuclear reactors, and the proposed site for two new ABWR reactors. Houston has a population of more than two million people, the fourth largest city in the U.S. The Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown metropolitan area is the sixth largest in the U.S. with more than 5.6 million people. In 1986, Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, also had a population about as big as Houston. Kiev is also about 70 miles from a collection of nuclear reactors located in the small city of Chernobyl. In April 1986, due primarily to human error, Chernobyl suffered from a catastrophic meltdown culminating in a massive explosion that ejected 50 tons of highly radioactive material up into the sky and another 70 tonnes outward, as compared to the 4.5 tons of highly radioactive materials contained in the first atomic bomb dropped on a city. In addition to the catastrophe which unfolded in and around Chernobyl, a city which no longer exists, and in spite of prevailing winds moving away from Kiev, the radiation levels in Kiev during the first three days after the explosion were as high as 100 milliroentgens per hour. By day 13, Kiev was experiencing 0.34 milliroentgens per hour according to official reports which were believed to be grossly understated. This is 8.6 milliroentgens per 24 hours, six times higher than the WHO norm. According to one source, at ground level the daily dose in Kiev was 300 times the WHO norm.

While I understand that the proposed ABWR is safer than the Chernobyl reactor, it is possible that there could be a meltdown at STP leading to a massive explosion causing a similar nuclear catastrophe. I would like the EIS to show what would happen to the people living in Houston, as well as those who live even closer. How many would die of severe radiation poisoning? A million? How many thousands of square miles of agricultural land would have to be abandoned for years to come? Also what about those living in San Antonio, the tenth largest city in the U.S. What about Austin, TX? As a U.S. citizen, I think an EIS should make these calculations and let the public know.

Possibly even worse than a reactor core meltdown would be a meltdown in one of the spent nuclear fuel pools. Please give us the effects of that.

4. Lastly, I know that more than half (by weight) of the biomass in the earth is in the form of microorganisms which live under the surface of the earth and bodies of water. The earth is teeming with life to depths below 10,000 feet, especially in coastal plains such as found around STP. Some of these organisms have beneficial effects on the biosphere, e.g., producing oxygen and absorbing carbon. I am concerned about the effect on these organisms which would result from a massive radioactive effluent leak into the ground, or cooling pond, or the Colorado River. An EIS should consider this important effect.

Sincerely,

Francis C. Payne
1919 A Harold St.
Houston, TX 77098
campayne@att.net

Tracking:

Recipient

Ronnie Gorham

Read

Read: 5/20/2008 4:06 PM

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 639

Mail Envelope Properties (88EDD64608FA36499C5AED7AC8B78FB44DA58C3FB0)

Subject: FW: Comments on scoping of the EIS for STP units 3 and 4
Sent Date: 5/20/2008 4:05:59 PM
Received Date: 5/20/2008 4:05:00 PM
From: Paul Kallan

Created By: Paul.Kallan@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Ronnie Gorham" <Ronnie.Gorham@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status:: Response: Read : 5/20/2008 4:06:00 PM

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6233	5/20/2008 4:05:00 PM

Options
Priority: High
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: Yes
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: