

**From:** "David Balgobin" <David\_Balgobin@geoworks.com>  
**To:** <pgn@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Oct 13, 2000 7:31 PM  
**Subject:** 20 year license extension - opposition

65 FR 53047

8-31-00

(80)

To: Patricia Norry, Director, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555

Re: Draft Report: Generic Aging Lessons Learned  
Nuclear Power Plant Relicensing Procedures

I strenuously oppose the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) plan to allow nuclear reactor owners to obtain 20-year license extensions based primarily on the "Generic Aging Lessons Learned" one-size-fits-all report, with no public hearings. There is no way that the GALL report could adequately cover all that could go wrong with aging reactors. It is time to close the nukes, not give them another 20 years to pollute our communities and run an ever-increasing risk of serious accident or meltdown.

As a professional engineer with over 25 years practice I'm intimately familiar with failure probabilities in aging systems. A 20 year license extension is simply an abandonment of good engineering practice, a decent into unknown technical territory with an aging technology whose failure consequences even insurance companies will not endure.

Finally, I ask who will be able to live with themselves or look in the mirror, when (not if) an accident occurs and irreparable damage has been wreaked upon the environment and possibly many lives greatly harmed.

I urge you to consider the bigger picture and veto this generic license extension; it is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do, it is the only option to take.

David A. Balgobin, PE.

**CC:** <CHAIRMAN@nrc.gov>

ADM03

ERIDS-03

Add Steve Koernick

SSK2

Raj Anand  
RKA

Template ADM 013