CallawayCEm Resource

From: Gavin [gavin53perry@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 11:54 PM
To: CallawayCOLEIS Resource
Cc: Bruce Olson; John Fringer
Subject: re Docket No 52–037 scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement for the AmerenUE application for a COL at the Callaway Plant Unit 2 site.

A letter to the NRC letter re Docket No 52–037 scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement for the AmerenUE application for a COL at the Callaway Plant Unit 2 site.

Dear Sirs and Madams,

In consideration of the opportunity for the public to participate in the scoping process for the EIS pursuant to the AmerenUE application for COL at the Callaway Plant Unit 2 site, I hereby request that the following items be seriously considered in the EIS as reasons for the denial of the COL.

First and foremost, every nuclear reactor creates long-lived, highly radioactive fuel rods from moderately radioactive fuel in the process of operating the plant. There is not now, and has never been, a place to dispose of this material once it is created. The Yucca Mountain facility, even if it is ever built, will not be able to take the highly radioactive waste from Callaway 1 as it is too new a reactor. A second reactor has no chance of having it's waste stored at the planned YM facility. Before such highly dangerous material is created, the EIS should clearly designate a disposal method and facility. If no clear disposal process has been designated for the high level waste of this plant, it would be irresponsible to allow it to be built.

This newly designed French Areva reactor has no operating history, and its design has not yet been certified by the NRC. How can the NRC provide assurance that this design can be operated without posing threats to the health and safety of the people living in the area and those down wind and down stream from this reactor?

As with Callaway-1, the second 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 AmerenUE perform of its waste water discharges? How many excess cancers per year will be considered tolerable for the operation of an electric generating facility?

People and other living things, downwind and downstream, would be exposed to radioactive gases released to the environment from the proposed 1600-megawatt Callaway-2 reactor. How would the gaseous emissions be filtered, monitored and reported? Will the effects of routine emissions be monitored by examining the increases in health effects on the populations downwind and down stream? How will it be determined when the cancer rates increase whether they are or are not caused by emissions from the Callaway plants? When non-routine emissions are vented, what provisions will be made to protect the public?

If AmerenUE were not able to fine adequately trained and experienced nuclear engineers and other personnel to operate and decommission the plant, what alternative plan would be required? How could the NRC assure the public that the quality control of the plant's operation and maintenance could be maintained safely? How can the NRC guarantee that the plant will be properly decommissioned at the end of it's "useful" life if financial markets experience another downturn such as we are now experiencing, and the operators are bankrupt?

These are only a few of the questions that should be answered before allowing another nuclear power plant to be built. With solar and wind technologies ramping up so quickly this decade, why would you even consider

generating power with such a risky and outdated technology as fission nuclear power?

Sincerely,

Gavin Perry PhD
Research Engineer
Washington Univ. School of Medicine
Campus Box 8006
4566 Scott Ave.
St. Louis MO 63110-1031
e-mail: gperry@wustl.edu
web: http://eshop.wustl.edu
voice: 314-362-2595

Federal Register Notice: 74FR4257
Comment Number: 38

Mail Envelope Properties (486a13d60903242054s20287f74o45e2c0c264b13904)

Subject: re Docket No 52–037 scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement for the AmerenUE application for a COL at the Callaway Plant Unit 2 site.
Sent Date: 3/24/2009 11:54:02 PM
Received Date: 3/24/2009 11:54:05 PM
From: Gavin

Created By: gavin53perry@gmail.com

Recipients:
"Bruce Olson" <Bruce.Olson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"John Fringer" <John.Fringer@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"CallawayCOLEIS Resource" <Callaway.COLEIS@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: mail.gmail.com

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	3686	3/24/2009 11:54:05 PM

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