

6/16/06

71FR 34969

**From:** "Dotty Reynolds" <ddreynolds@all2ez.net>  
**To:** <OysterCreekEIS@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, Jul 5, 2006 4:57 PM  
**Subject:** U.S.Nuclear Regulatory Commission Hearing

24

COMMENTS FOR OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR PLANT PUBLIC HEARINGS, JULY 12, 2006

No one expected a tsunami wave to sweep across Indonesia, leaving a swath of death and destruction. No one thought a category 5 hurricane would strike the Gulf coast, causing levees to collapse in New Orleans. No one believed terrorists could fly into the world trade center, collapsing the twin towers and killing almost 3,000 people. No one expects a nuclear accident of catastrophic proportions at Oyster Creek, but should we trust the oldest nuclear plant in the U.S. to operate safely for another 20 years?

It is imperative that all safety factors and concerns be examined. How can the NRC be allowed to ignore issues which the State of New Jersey considers important? The steel drywell liner, the barrier preventing the release of radiation during a reactor accident, needs close scrutiny. Why are tests not being done now to measure the thickness of the drywell liner, despite previous evidence of corrosion? Should we risk a terrorist attack at the site of a nuclear plant with on-site storage of spent nuclear fuel? In the event of an accident, the evacuation route is unworkable for much of the area, including all of Long Beach Island.

We do know that millions of small fish, shrimp and other aquatic animals are currently being killed due to the fact that the plant has no water cooling towers. Cooling towers are a necessity to prevent these losses of marine life which are trapped against water intake screens, or drawn into the plant, or killed by the change in water temperature in the bay. Restoring wetlands is not a reasonable alternative.

The NRC may do doing an extensive in depth review, but unless all concerns are considered objectively, the results will be flawed. If the nuclear plant is deemed necessary for power, then a new plant as planned in the 70's, should replace the current obsolete plant with one in the new safer design.

In spite of the best maintenance and replacement of parts, the older our car, the greater the likelihood our car will break down. If we want to ensure that we will get to work every day, safely, we routinely replace our car with a new one. How long would we continue to drive a car, or should we operate a nuclear plant, which could break down with dire consequences?

The decision regarding license renewal could mean life or death for thousands; the potential health, safety and economic impacts on New Jersey are enormous. Congressman Jim Saxton, in support of requests by many elected officials and citizen groups, has introduced H.R. 966, a bill that would require an independent assessment of safety and security issues by the National Academy of Sciences Research Council. It is imperative that the Academy of Sciences determine that Oyster Creek nuclear plant is safe, secure and necessary, prior

RECEIVED

2006 OCT 24 PM 3:16

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
U.S.NRC

SONSI Review Complete

template = ADM-013

E-REDS = ADM-03

add = M. Yurank (MTR2)

to NRC relicensing approval, or Oyster Creek must be shut down.

\$4.95/mo. National Dialup, Anti-Spam, Anti-Virus, 5mb personal web space. 5x faster dialup for only \$9.95/mo. No contracts, No fees, No Kidding! See <http://www.All2Easy.net> for more details!

**Mail Envelope Properties** (44AC27BA.47B : 12 : 13435)

**Subject:** U.S.Nuclear Regulatory Commission Hearing  
**Creation Date:** Wed, Jul 5, 2006 4:57 PM  
**From:** "Dotty Reynolds" <[ddreynolds@all2ez.net](mailto:ddreynolds@all2ez.net)>  
**Created By:** [ddreynolds@all2ez.net](mailto:ddreynolds@all2ez.net)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
 TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
 OysterCreekEIS

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3115	Wednesday, July 5, 2006 4:57 PM
Mime.822	4261	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** High  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling  
 This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User  
 Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator  
 Junk List is not enabled  
 Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled  
 Block List is not enabled