

Debra Wilson
119 Park Ave.
St. Louis, MO 63122

Chief, Rulemaking, Directives and Editing Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop TWB-05-B01M
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

March 9, 2009

Dear U.S. NRC,

Please rethink any plans you have for expanding the nuclear reactor program at the Callaway County plant site. There are many reasons why I am opposed to a second reactor at that site.

1. I have heard that the French Areva reactor has no operating history, although I do understand that there is a dismal construction record to consider. The public should not be placed into the position of being "guinea pigs" for this project. Would you please include an analysis in the environmental impact statement of the reactor, steam electric system, and the heat dissipation system that will assure the public that the reactor will not threaten the health and safety of the public?
2. I am concerned about the safety and quality of the drinking water. I hope the EIS will include a thorough description of any radioactive materials that may be discharged into the Missouri river during the operation of the plant. I am worried about the people who live downwind and downstream from this site. I hope that the EIS will describe the expected gaseous and liquid emissions from the site.
3. I understand that there is a shortage of qualified and experienced personnel to manage current operating reactors as well as future reactors that may be constructed. Could the EIS include an analysis of the ability to operate a 1600 megawatt reactor safely if an adequate source of experienced reactor operators is not available?
4. I am concerned about the transportation of a high-level radioactive waste to a permanent disposal site. Could you please describe in the EIS what actions would be taken by the licensee to reduce the likelihood of an accident, or, perhaps, a terrorist attempt to capture the deadly materials?
5. I believe there maybe no safe, permanent site for the disposal for the low-level nuclear waste that will be generated by the reactor, such as filters for the gaseous and liquid waste discharges. Could the EIS include a description of what efforts are being made to establish a permanent disposal site? If we cannot safely and permanently store or dispose of the waste, **why do we keep creating it?** It is highly irresponsible to be generating radioactive waste that will be a dangerous burden to many future generations.
6. Could you please include in the EIS an accounting of the personnel and corporations that would be liable for any injuries or deaths, or for any damage to personal property in the case of an accident at the reactor site, at a storage or disposal facility, or during transit of the waste? Please include a description of whether the people living along the trucking routes or rail lines would be responsible for their own safety and for the value of their property?
7. Please include a description of the availability of first-responders living and working near the reactor site and along any shipping routes. Who would be responsible for their equipment and training in preparation for a possible worst-case scenario incident? Please describe whether there is anything they could do aside from cordoning off the area while being exposed to lethal materials?

These are just a few of the questions that I hope you will address when considering the environmental impacts of operating another reactor at Callaway, or anywhere in our nation. I hope that my electric utility will recognize the risks of investing more money and other resources in nuclear energy. We must focus on safe and clean energy sources. Nuclear energy is surely not safe and, with the threat of lethal emissions and the burden of radioactive waste, it is not clean.

Sincerely,

Debra Wilson
Debra Wilson

E-REDS = ADM-03

Call = B. Olson (6901)

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

1/23/04
74FR 4257

5

RECEIVED

2009 MAR 17 AM 9:45

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
15475