

1/23/09
74FR 4257
9

Michael Berg
5 Cedar Crest
St. Louis, MO 63132
March 16, 2009

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

Federal Register, January 23, 2009, pp.4257-8

To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Please address the following questions in the Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed second nuclear reactor at the Callaway site in Callaway County, Missouri.

1. Last year the Barnwell facility in South Carolina, the place that Callaway sent its most radioactive "low-level" waste, stopped accepting Callaway's waste. The Obama administration has just rejected Yucca Mountain as a viable permanent storage facility for "high-level" waste. Until future sites are developed and approved for both "low-level" and "high-level" waste, we must plan for the distinct possibility of a future in which the waste will never leave Callaway County. The radioactive isotope Plutonium-239 has a half-life of 24,000. Other radioactive isotopes have half-lives up to 2.3 million years and longer. No state or empire in history has lasted more than 1000 years before collapsing from within or being conquered.
 - a. Given these facts, in the event that the waste is never moved, would you please include in your Environmental Impact Statement a description of how you plan to protect the safety of people living, farming, and fishing near the plant in the absence of a Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Ameren UE, a functioning government and an advanced industrial civilization? In other words, what regulations will you put in place to make sure that the waste would be permanently and safely contained on site at Callaway in a manner that does not require monitoring and maintenance?
 - b. What is the cost assessment of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for safely containing the high-level and low-level nuclear waste on-site for the next 1000 millennia?
 - c. What measures are being taken to warn future generations of the dangers that our present waste poses for them?

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH

MAR 24 AM 9:32

RECEIVED

SUNSI Review Complete

F-RIDS-ADM-03

Template = ADM-013

Call = B. Olson (6901)

2. The newly designed French Areva reactor has no operating history, and its design has not yet been certified by the NRC. It would make sense that the NRC would determine whether or not the new reactor design could legally be built before making a judgment on the environmental impact from building and operating the reactor. Will the NRC consider delaying its Environmental Impact Statement until a decision is made on whether or not to approve the new reactor design?
3. As with Callaway-1, the proposed second 1600-megawatt reactor would routinely discharge radioactively contaminated water back into the Missouri River, upstream from the drinking water of St. Louis. What kind of monitoring would the NRC require that Ameren UE perform of its waste water discharges?
4. Also the same as Callaway-1, people and other living things, downwind and downstream, would be exposed to radioactive gases released to the environment from the proposed Callaway-2 reactor. How would the gaseous emissions be filtered, monitored, and reported?
5. According to American Nuclear Society president William Burchill (American Nuclear Society News, January/February 2009), almost half of all present nuclear workers plan to retire during the next five years, and there are not enough trained nuclear workers to replace them at this time. If Ameren UE were not able to find adequately trained and experienced nuclear engineers and other personnel to operate and decommission the plant, what alternative plan would be required? In this scenario, how could the NRC assure the public that the quality control of the plant's operation and maintenance would function in a safe manner?

Thank you for your attention on this matter.

Sincerely,
Michael Berg

