Ryan Hasko
107 Hillside Ave
Midland Park, NJ 07432

3/2/2010
75 FR 9445
3

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ryan Hasko
107 Hillside Ave
Midland Park, NJ 07432

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 9:28
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = R. Ennis (RXE)
A. Baxter (AXB8)

Cynthia Casner
348 Constitution Circle
North Brunswick, NJ 08902

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Cynthia Casner
348 Constitution Circle
North Brunswick, NJ 08902

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 9: 25
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

Sandra DeSmedt
302 Harrison St.
Boonton, NJ 07005-2040

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Sandra DeSmedt
302 Harrison St.
Boonton, NJ 07005-2040

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 9: 25
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

Katherine Coyle
32 East Lake Blvd.
Morristown, NJ 07960

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Katherine Coyle
32 East Lake Blvd.
Morristown, NJ 07960

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 9: 25
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

Nicholas Mantas
372 Wilson Avenue
T
Township of Washington, NJ 07676

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Nicholas Mantas
372 Wilson Avenue
T
Township of Washington, NJ 07676

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 9: 25
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

Gertrude Armstrong
133 Castleton Road
Princeton, NJ 08540

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Gertrude Armstrong
133 Castleton Road
Princeton, NJ 08540

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 9:25
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

John Coyle
32 E Lake Blvd
Morristown, NJ 07960

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

John Coyle
32 E Lake Blvd
Morristown, NJ 07960

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 9: 25
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

Christina Lizzi
1448 Spring Rd NW
Washington, DC 20010

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Christina Lizzi
1448 Spring Rd NW
Washington, DC 20010

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 10: 43
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

Sarah Alexander
1117 N St. NW
Washington, DC 20005

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Sarah Alexander
1117 N St. NW
Washington, DC 20005

RECEIVED
2010 MAR 31 AM 10: 43
RULES AND DIRECTIVES BRANCH USNRC

Kathy Ridge
PO Box 864
Ocean City, NJ 08226

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kathy Ridge
PO Box 864
Ocean City, NJ 08226

linda grice
69 franklin terr
irvington, NJ 07111

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

linda grice
69 franklin terr
irvington, NJ 07111

Jamie Strait
16 Hillside dr
Bloomingdale, NJ 07403

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Jamie Strait
16 Hillside dr
Bloomingdale, NJ 07403

Whitney Swain
202 Franklin Ave
Maplewood, NJ 07040

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Whitney Swain
202 Franklin Ave
Maplewood, NJ 07040

Lauren Carmen
P. O. Box 193
P.O.Box 193
Franklin Park, NJ 08823

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lauren Carmen
P. O. Box 193
P.O.Box 193
Franklin Park, NJ 08823

Cheri Dzubak
69 Elton Avenue
Yardville, NJ 08620

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Cheri Dzubak
69 Elton Avenue
Yardville, NJ 08620

Alice Diane Celebre
Back Brook Road
Back Brook Road
Ringoes, NJ 08551

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Alice Diane Celebre
Back Brook Road
Back Brook Road
Ringoes, NJ 08551

Nadine Sapirman
17 More Road
Hillsborough, NJ 08844

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Nadine Sapirman
17 More Road
Hillsborough, NJ 08844

Ellen McConnell
14 Winsor Ct
Sayreville, NJ 08872

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ellen McConnell
14 Winsor Ct
Sayreville, NJ 08872

Carolyn de Smet
28 Sunset Terrace
Mount Arlington, NJ 07856

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Carolyn de Smet
28 Sunset Terrace
Mount Arlington, NJ 07856

Barbara Marcellino
103 Golden Wheat Court
hammonton, NJ 08037

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Barbara Marcellino
103 Golden Wheat Court
hammonton, NJ 08037

Michael Carney
25 Bowers Ave.
Runnemede, NJ 08078

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Michael Carney
25 Bowers Ave.
Runnemede, NJ 08078

Melissa Brown
39 Oberlin Street
Maplewood, NJ 07040

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Melissa Brown
39 Oberlin Street
Maplewood, NJ 07040

delis guzman
11 byrne place
bergenfield, NJ 07621

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

delis guzman
11 byrne place
bergenfield, NJ 07621

John Clements
124 Lake St
Englewood, NJ 07631

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

John Clements
124 Lake St
Englewood, NJ 07631

Lori Saporito
41 Hart Avenue
Hopewell, NJ 08525

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lori Saporito
41 Hart Avenue
Hopewell, NJ 08525

Lisa Levine
34 linden Lane
Princeton, NJ 08540

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lisa Levine
34 linden Lane
Princeton, NJ 08540

J Manicone
408 Chatfield Dr
Chatfiels Dr
pompton Plains, NJ 07444

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

J Manicone
408 Chatfield Dr
Chatfiels Dr
pompton Plains, NJ 07444

Susan Duffy
325 Grand Street
Apt. 4-R
Hoboken, NJ 07030

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Susan Duffy
325 Grand Street
Apt. 4-R
Hoboken, NJ 07030

Eileen McNamara
515 Garden Street
Hoboken, NJ 07030

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Eileen McNamara
515 Garden Street
Hoboken, NJ 07030

Shirley Bensetler
333 brookside ave
Cresskill, NJ 07626

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Shirley Bensetler
333 brookside ave
Cresskill, NJ 07626

Karen Brozek
86 Ryefield Drive
Old Orchard Beach, ME 04064

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Karen Brozek
86 Ryefield Drive
Old Orchard Beach, ME 04064

Ken Safir
221 North 2nd Avenue
Highland Park, NJ 08904

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ken Safir
221 North 2nd Avenue
Highland Park, NJ 08904

blair hamilton
1812 muriel ct.
princeton, NJ 08540

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

blair hamilton
1812 muriel ct.
princeton, NJ 08540

Patricia Jenatsch
51 WINDING WAY
MORRIS PLAINS, NJ 07950

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by Public Service Electric & Gas ("PSEG") to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public. New Jersey's highways are highly trafficked especially during rush hour. Unfortunately, many out of state trucks and autos rush through the eastern corridor without regard to speed and safety issues. The transportation of additional radioactive materials through our state is dangerous and an accident waiting to happen.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been soundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances. If consumers continue to reject the irradiation of foodstuffs, a backlog of unsold Cobalt-60 will result and need to be disposed of in a safe and timely fashion. New Jersey already has the most Superfund sites in the United States. Let's not add to this number due to PSE&G's bad business decisions.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Patricia Jenatsch
51 WINDING WAY

MORRIS PLAINS, NJ 07950

Elizabeth Bowman
312 Windsor Ave
Hopatcong, NJ 07843

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bowman
312 Windsor Ave
Hopatcong, NJ 07843

Nancy Sullivan
975 Grandview Avenue
Union, NJ 07083

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Nancy Sullivan
975 Grandview Avenue
Union, NJ 07083

margie coughlin
126 ashurst ln
mount holly, NJ 08060

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

margie coughlin
126 ashurst ln
mount holly, NJ 08060

beth schultz
188 Lakeside Blvd
Hamilton, NJ 08610

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

beth schultz
188 Lakeside Blvd
Hamilton, NJ 08610

Daniel J. Shields
31 Myrtle Ave
Keansburg, NJ 07734

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Daniel J. Shields
31 Myrtle Ave
Keansburg, NJ 07734

Richard Harold
2206 First Ave. Apt. 10A
Asbury Park, NJ 07712

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Richard Harold
2206 First Ave. Apt. 10A
Asbury Park, NJ 07712

Carroll Arkema
221 Ringwood Ave - A3
Pompton Lakes, NJ 07442

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Carroll Arkema
221 Ringwood Ave - A3
Pompton Lakes, NJ 07442

Toni Gandel
403 Edgemont Dr
Allenhurst, NJ 07711

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Toni Gandel
403 Edgemont Dr
Allenhurst, NJ 07711

Debora Simpkins
504 Old Indian Mills Rd.
Tabernacle, NJ 08088

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to produce Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Debora Simpkins
504 Old Indian Mills Rd.
Tabernacle, NJ 08088

Sally Gellert
210 Broadway
Woodcliff Lake, NJ 07677

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that I believe that this proposal ids deeply flawed and therefore should not be approved, as follows:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones. I say this as a PSEG shareholder, worried that the company of which I own a (very small)part may put employees, neighbors, and my investment at risk.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public. I live in New Jersey. No matter where the Cobalt-60 is shipped, my fellow citizens are put at some risk by the transportation of this radioactive matter.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60: Should We Irradiate Food?
I don?t believe so. Although one potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food, and despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is a ?no-starter?; it is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek (or anywhere else) or to risk transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG. I will be writing to the Board of Directors of PSEG as a shareholder to urge them to reconsider this ill-advised program and investment.
Cordially yours,

Sally Gellert
210 Broadway
Woodcliff Lake, NJ 07677

Amy Luo
2 Outpost Court
North Potomac, MD 20878

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to produce Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Amy Luo
2 Outpost Court
North Potomac, MD 20878

Glenn Lyons
206 West End Ave
Hopatcong, NJ 07843

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Glenn Lyons
206 West End Ave
Hopatcong, NJ 07843

Tasha Brinn
11 Bedford Ct.
Marlton, NJ 08053

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Tasha Brinn
11 Bedford Ct.
Marlton, NJ 08053

Tasha Brinn
11 Bedford Ct.
Marlton, NJ 08053

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Tasha Brinn
11 Bedford Ct.
Marlton, NJ 08053

Larry Siegel
2113 Fox Run Drive
Plainsboro, NJ 08536

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Larry Siegel
2113 Fox Run Drive
Plainsboro, NJ 08536

Lauren Seddon
80 Shawnee Pl
Galloway, NJ 08205

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lauren Seddon
80 Shawnee Pl
Galloway, NJ 08205

jennifer tozzi
1141 carlow drive
toms river, NJ 08753

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

jennifer tozzi
1141 carlow drive
toms river, NJ 08753

Janice Dlugosz
409 Compass Ave
Beachwood, NJ 08722

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Janice Dlugosz
409 Compass Ave
Beachwood, NJ 08722

David Turner
45 Rocco Street, Apt. C6
Belleville, NJ 07109

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

David Turner
45 Rocco Street, Apt. C6
Belleville, NJ 07109

Peter Puccio
10 Skyview Drive
Rockaway, NJ 07866

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Peter Puccio
10 Skyview Drive
Rockaway, NJ 07866

Andrea Locklear
820 Circle Avenue
Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Andrea Locklear
820 Circle Avenue
Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

D Miller
114 Center Street
Garwood, NJ 07027

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

D Miller
114 Center Street
Garwood, NJ 07027

Paul Netusil
9 Lachmund Court
Old Tappan, NJ 07675-7237

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Paul Netusil
9 Lachmund Court
Old Tappan, NJ 07675-7237

marvin brickner
2 b truro drive
monroe twp, NJ 08831

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

marvin brickner
2 b truro drive
monroe twp, NJ 08831

Patricia Witel
6 Genoble Rd
Montville, NJ 07045

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Patricia Witel
6 Genoble Rd
Montville, NJ 07045

Susan Struening
401 Martin Road
Union, NJ 07083

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Susan Struening
401 Martin Road
Union, NJ 07083

Johanna Moy
2625 Jackson Ditch Road
Harrington, DE 19952

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Johanna Moy
2625 Jackson Ditch Road
Harrington, DE 19952

Joseph Vincze
34 Quince Place
North Brnswick, NJ 08902

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joseph Vincze
34 Quince Place
North Brnswick, NJ 08902

Andrew Zugay
532 Old Marlton Pike #177
Marlton, NJ 08053

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Andrew Zugay
532 Old Marlton Pike #177
Marlton, NJ 08053

Kate Richman
209 Milltown Rd
East Brunswick, NJ 08816

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kate Richman
209 Milltown Rd
East Brunswick, NJ 08816

Joy Sullivan
16 Linmor Ave
Newton, NJ 07860

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joy Sullivan
16 Linmor Ave
Newton, NJ 07860

Elizabeth Olney
16 N Sussex St.
Dover, NJ 07801

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Elizabeth Olney
16 N Sussex St.
Dover, NJ 07801

Luis Cavallone
22 Paula Dr.
Long Valley, NJ 07853

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Luis Cavallone
22 Paula Dr.
Long Valley, NJ 07853

Alan Felauer
26 Clauss St.
Carteret, NJ 07008

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Alan Felauer
26 Clauss St.
Carteret, NJ 07008

Peter Mulshine
23 Hudson st.
phillipsburg, NJ 08865

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Peter Mulshine
23 Hudson st.
phillipsburg, NJ 08865

Stephen Evans
161 Spring Lane
Paramus, NJ 07652

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Stephen Evans
161 Spring Lane
Paramus, NJ 07652

Elan Berko
PO Box 3356
Fort Lee, NJ 07024

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Elan Berko
PO Box 3356
Fort Lee, NJ 07024

Elizabeth Olney
16 N Sussex St.
16 N Sussex St.
Dover, NJ 07801

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Elizabeth Olney
16 N Sussex St.
16 N Sussex St.
Dover, NJ 07801

anita kasbarian
178 boulevard
kenilworth, NJ 07033

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

anita kasbarian
178 boulevard
kenilworth, NJ 07033

Ethel Tarantino
72 Park Ave
Flemington, NJ 08822 1170

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ethel Tarantino
72 Park Ave
Flemington, NJ 08822 1170

Frank Cano
7 Sixth St
Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Frank Cano
7 Sixth St
Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660

Tierney Grinavic
4735 Paul Hance Rd
Huntingtown, MD 20639

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Tierney Grinavic
4735 Paul Hance Rd
Huntingtown, MD 20639

Allison Petryk
11 Malibu
Vernon, NJ 07462

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Allison Petryk
11 Malibu
Vernon, NJ 07462

Barbara Miller
12 Ben Franklin Dr.
Franklin, NJ 07416

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Barbara Miller
12 Ben Franklin Dr.
Franklin, NJ 07416

Janet Robbins
122 Lower Creek Rd.
Stockton, NJ 08559

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Janet Robbins
122 Lower Creek Rd.
Stockton, NJ 08559

jay steele
41 madison ave
lindenwold, NJ 08021

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

jay steele
41 madison ave
lindenwold, NJ 08021

Maggie Certa
Bay Ave
Toms River, NJ 08753

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Maggie Certa
Bay Ave
Toms River, NJ 08753

Eugene Gorrin
2607 Frederick Terrace
Union, NJ 07083

To Whom It May Concern:

I oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons why this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:

The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60

One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I respectfully request that you reject this proposal from PSEG.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Eugene Gorrin
2607 Frederick Terrace
Union, NJ 07083

Michaela Redden
8 Fraesco Lane
Norwood, NJ 07648

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Michaela Redden
8 Fraesco Lane
Norwood, NJ 07648

William Risano
714 Bergen St
Harrison, NJ 07029

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

William Risano
714 Bergen St
Harrison, NJ 07029

Joan Yakimik
167 Pierre Ave
Garfield, NJ 07026

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joan Yakimik
167 Pierre Ave
Garfield, NJ 07026

Laura Robinson
25 Collinwood Road
Maplewood, NJ 07040-1035

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Laura Robinson
25 Collinwood Road
Maplewood, NJ 07040-1035

Fran Alvarez
12 Old township Road
Flanders, NJ 07836

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Fran Alvarez
12 Old township Road
Flanders, NJ 07836

Rebecca Gough
149 Delacy Avenue
North Plainfield, NJ 07060

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Rebecca Gough
149 Delacy Avenue
North Plainfield, NJ 07060

Toni Johnson
18 Tanya Circle
Ocean, NJ 07712

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Toni Johnson
18 Tanya Circle
Ocean, NJ 07712

Adam Kean
321 Belvidere Ave
Oxford, NJ 07863

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Adam Kean
321 Belvidere Ave
Oxford, NJ 07863

tracy mclarnon
177 walnut ave
bogota, NJ 07603

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

tracy mclarnon
177 walnut ave
bogota, NJ 07603

Sharon Bort
5 Sweeney Ct.
Green Brook, NJ 08812

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Sharon Bort
5 Sweeney Ct.
Green Brook, NJ 08812

George Schaefer
9 Leone Terrace
Kinnelon, NJ 07405

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

George Schaefer
9 Leone Terrace
Kinnelon, NJ 07405

Emily B
79 Winchester road
Livingston, NJ 07039

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Emily B
79 Winchester road
Livingston, NJ 07039

Kenneth Barta
230 Brunswick Avenue
Spotswood, NJ 08884-1050

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kenneth Barta
230 Brunswick Avenue
Spotswood, NJ 08884-1050

Jessie Myrie
48 Davis Avenue
Hackensack, NJ 07601

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Jessie Myrie
48 Davis Avenue
Hackensack, NJ 07601

Karen Marchese
786 Haddon Ave
Apt 1
Collingswood, NJ 08108

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Karen Marchese
786 Haddon Ave
Apt 1
Collingswood, NJ 08108

Ann Smith
89 Hillside Ave
West Orange, NJ 07052

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ann Smith
89 Hillside Ave
West Orange, NJ 07052

Reggie Thomas
33 Donald st
Bloomfield, NJ 07003

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Reggie Thomas
33 Donald st
Bloomfield, NJ 07003

Arlene Patoray
55 Azalea Street
Paramus, NJ 07652

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Arlene Patoray
55 Azalea Street
Paramus, NJ 07652

H Sudol
36 Madison Ave
Madison, NJ 07940

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

H Sudol

H Sudol
36 Madison Ave
Madison, NJ 07940

Nicholas DeVincenzo
307 white ave
307 white ave
Northvale, NJ 07647

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Nicholas DeVincenzo
307 white ave
307 white ave
Northvale, NJ 07647

Jan Nelson
6040 Kennedy Blvd. East
Apt. 19G
West New York, NJ 07093

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Jan Nelson
6040 Kennedy Blvd. East
Apt. 19G
West New York, NJ 07093

Marty Coleman
84 Merrill Road
Clifton, NJ 07012-1622

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Marty Coleman
84 Merrill Road
Clifton, NJ 07012-1622

Patricia Stucker
34 Wisse ST #9
34 Wisse St
Lodi, NJ 07644-3811

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Patricia Stucker
34 Wisse ST #9
34 Wisse St
Lodi, NJ 07644-3811

Suzanne Scheible
10 Summit Road
Andover, NJ 07821

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Suzanne Scheible
10 Summit Road
Andover, NJ 07821

Nancy Sullivan
975 Grandview Avenue
975 Grandview Avenue Union NJ 07083
Union, NJ 07083

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Nancy Sullivan
975 Grandview Avenue
975 Grandview Avenue Union NJ 07083
Union, NJ 07083

Ed Jocz
152 Old Post Road
Freehold, NJ 07728-3149

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to produce Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ed Jocz
152 Old Post Road
Freehold, NJ 07728-3149

Margaret Southwell
113 Glenwood Rd.
Fanwood, NJ 07023

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Margaret Southwell
113 Glenwood Rd.
Fanwood, NJ 07023

Joyce Orenstein
305 south second avenue
Highland park, NJ 08904

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joyce Orenstein
305 south second avenue
Highland park, NJ 08904

Rhonda VanWingerden
841 2nd St
Ocean City, NJ 08226

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Rhonda VanWingerden
841 2nd St
Ocean City, NJ 08226

Debbie Salerno
377 Middle Road
Hazlet, NJ 07730

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Debbie Salerno
377 Middle Road
Hazlet, NJ 07730

Russell Tepper
2 Natures Court
Flanders, NJ 07836

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to SUPPORT the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, while also expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This is a minimal risk.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. The food irradiation industry is definitely viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek and transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to approve this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Russell Tepper
2 Natures Court
Flanders, NJ 07836

tammy steinman
241 windsor rd
wood-ridge, NJ 07075

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

tammy steinman
241 windsor rd
wood-ridge, NJ 07075

Robin Hagelberg
13 Boonton Ave
Butler, NJ 07405

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Robin Hagelberg
13 Boonton Ave
Butler, NJ 07405

Karl Hunting
E3 Riverview Drive
South River, NJ 08882

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Karl Hunting
E3 Riverview Drive
South River, NJ 08882

Gerard M Johnson
40 Lakeshore Dr
Oakland, NJ 07436

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Gerard M Johnson
40 Lakeshore Dr
Oakland, NJ 07436

Rena D
.
,
Dallas, TX 75238

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Rena D
.
,
Dallas, TX 75238

Andrew Sedlak
345 Richmond Avenue
South Orange, NJ 07079

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Andrew Sedlak
345 Richmond Avenue
South Orange, NJ 07079

DAVE SPIELER
2357 FINLAW AVE.
PENNSAUKEN, NJ 08109

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

DAVE SPIELER
2357 FINLAW AVE.
PENNSAUKEN, NJ 08109

Carlos Oropeza
106 Ava Ave
Somerdale, NJ 08083

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Carlos Oropeza
106 Ava Ave
Somerdale, NJ 08083

Patricia Morris
N 6th ave
highland park, NJ 08904

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Patricia Morris
N 6th ave
highland park, NJ 08904

Morgan Clark
203 Academy St
South Orange, NJ 07079

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Morgan Clark
203 Academy St
South Orange, NJ 07079

Charlie McCullagh
311 river rd
red bank, NJ 07701-2370

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Charlie McCullagh
311 river rd
red bank, NJ 07701-2370

Kevin Pflug
1180 Raymond Blvd.,
Apt. 9k
Newark, NJ 07102

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kevin Pflug
1180 Raymond Blvd.,
Apt. 9k
Newark, NJ 07102

Helga Spector
28 Spring St.
Somerset, NJ 08873

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to produce Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Helga Spector
28 Spring St.
Somerset, NJ 08873

Victoria Griswold
816 Madison Ave
Plainfield, NJ 07060

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Victoria Griswold
816 Madison Ave
Plainfield, NJ 07060

Emily Bittner
6 shore Rd.
Wantage, NJ 07461

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.

Sincerely,

Emily Bittner

Emily Bittner
6 shore Rd.
Wantage, NJ 07461

Ray Bell
1849 Golden State Avenue
Apartment J
Bakersfield, CA 93301-1015

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ray Bell
1849 Golden State Avenue
Apartment J
Bakersfield, CA 93301-1015

Christine M.C.Money
5 Douglas Drive
Long Valley, NJ 07853

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Christine M.C.Money
5 Douglas Drive
Long Valley, NJ 07853

Kristina VanIstendal
30 N. Indian Valley Court
Little Egg Harbor, NJ 08087

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kristina VanIstendal
30 N. Indian Valley Court
Little Egg Harbor, NJ 08087

Markham Burton
Hamilton
Somerset, NJ 08873

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Markham Burton
Hamilton
Somerset, NJ 08873

Diane Bruce
44 East Walnut Street
Metuchen, NJ 08840

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Diane Bruce
44 East Walnut Street
Metuchen, NJ 08840

Barry McCloud
708 Cornelia Street
Boonton, NJ 07005-1618

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Barry McCloud
708 Cornelia Street
Boonton, NJ 07005-1618

Regina Navickas
143 Ticetown Road
Old Bridge, NJ 08857

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Regina Navickas
143 Ticetown Road
Old Bridge, NJ 08857

renu jagasia
40 Tall Oaks dr.
40 Tall Oaks Dr.
East brunswick, NJ 08816

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

renu jagasia
40 Tall Oaks dr.
40 Tall Oaks Dr.
East brunswick, NJ 08816

Matthew Franck
119 Livingston Ave Apt 5G
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-2456

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Matthew Franck
119 Livingston Ave Apt 5G
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-2456

David Melvin
21 Cromwell Drive
Chester, NJ 07930

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

David Melvin
21 Cromwell Drive
Chester, NJ 07930

marc winter
13 Old Army Post Rd.
Morristown, NJ 07960

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

marc winter
13 Old Army Post Rd.
Morristown, NJ 07960

Luis Medina
30 Hemlock St.
Hazlet, NJ 07730

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Luis Medina
30 Hemlock St.
Hazlet, NJ 07730

chris palmaro
744 blvd east
weehawken, NJ 07086

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

chris palmaro
744 blvd east
weehawken, NJ 07086

Grace Willard
110 Blue Spring Road
Princeton, NJ 08540

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Grace Willard
110 Blue Spring Road
Princeton, NJ 08540

Lea Callahan
20 Rustic Way
Freehold, NJ 07728

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,
Lea Callahan

Lea Callahan
20 Rustic Way
Freehold, NJ 07728

Lance Michel
60 Wayne St
Apt #1
Jersey City, NJ 07302

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lance Michel
60 Wayne St
Apt #1
Jersey City, NJ 07302

Noah Howard
1924 South Central Ave
Apt. 501
South Plainfield, NJ 07080

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Noah Howard
1924 South Central Ave
Apt. 501
South Plainfield, NJ 07080

C Reed
5203 Tudor Dr
Pompton Plains, NJ 07444

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

C Reed
5203 Tudor Dr
Pompton Plains, NJ 07444

Michael Masley
20 N. Arlington St.
Manville, NJ 08835

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Michael Masley
20 N. Arlington St.
Manville, NJ 08835

Leia Cairns
1133 Mermaid Avenue
BEACHWOOD, NJ 08722

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Leia Cairns
1133 Mermaid Avenue
BEACHWOOD, NJ 08722

Susan Morrison
31 Hanover Rd
Mountain Lakes, NJ 07046

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Susan Morrison
31 Hanover Rd
Mountain Lakes, NJ 07046

Julie van Niekerk
Plot 74
8th Road
Grasland Ten Acres, NJ 08066

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Julie van Niekerk
Plot 74
8th Road
Grasland Ten Acres, NJ 08066

sandrine cortet
19b3 redfield Vlge
edison, NJ 08837

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

sandrine cortet
19b3 redfield Vlge
edison, NJ 08837

Rebecca Frost
1300 Grand St
Apt 518
Hoboken, NJ 07030

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Rebecca Frost
1300 Grand St
Apt 518
Hoboken, NJ 07030

carol jagiello
91 wood pl
bloomingdale, NJ 07403-1426

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

carol jagiello
91 wood pl
bloomingdale, NJ 07403-1426

Joanne DeCuollo
pOBox 175
93 Bingham Ave.
Rumson, NJ 07760

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joanne DeCuollo
pOBox 175
93 Bingham Ave.
Rumson, NJ 07760

Olivia Haub
510 Center St
Garwood, NJ 07027

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Olivia Haub
510 Center St
Garwood, NJ 07027

Susan Zega
40 Highland Ave
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Susan Zega
40 Highland Ave
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

Nick Berezansky
123 Washington Pl.
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Nick Berezansky
123 Washington Pl.
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Richard Pecha
5 Millburn Rd
Lake Hopatcong, NJ 07849

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Richard Pecha
5 Millburn Rd
Lake Hopatcong, NJ 07849

Julia Johnson
2245 Bristol Rd
Columbus, OH 43221

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Julia Johnson
2245 Bristol Rd
Columbus, OH 43221

Patrick Jordan
313 Varick St.
Jersey City, NJ 07302

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Patrick Jordan
313 Varick St.
Jersey City, NJ 07302

Kristin DeValue
55 Leonard Drive
Wyckoff, NJ 07481

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kristin DeValue
55 Leonard Drive
Wyckoff, NJ 07481

Marc Santora
151 Pines Lake Drive East
Unit B
Wayne, NJ 07470

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Marc Santora
151 Pines Lake Drive East
Unit B
Wayne, NJ 07470

Lauren Rosenzweig
62 Livingston Lane
Manalapn, NJ 07726

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lauren Rosenzweig
62 Livingston Lane
Manalapn, NJ 07726

M. Chris Moser
181 Long Hill Road
Little Falls, NJ 07424

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

M. Chris Moser
181 Long Hill Road
Little Falls, NJ 07424

Debbie OBrien
13 Circle Blvd
Newfoundland, NJ 07435

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Debbie OBrien
13 Circle Blvd
Newfoundland, NJ 07435

georgina shanley
bay avenue
ocean city, NJ 08226

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

georgina shanley
bay avenue
ocean city, NJ 08226

Ruth Leibowitz
137 Seabreeze Way
Keansburg, NJ 07734

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ruth Leibowitz
137 Seabreeze Way
Keansburg, NJ 07734

kurt carlson
14 sycamore lane
toms river, NJ 08753

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

kurt carlson
14 sycamore lane
toms river, NJ 08753

joseph attamante
52 fairmount ave.
morristown, NJ 07960

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

joseph attamante
52 fairmount ave.
morristown, NJ 07960

David Gauff
20 Rick Rd.
Milford, NJ 08848-2110

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

David Gauff
20 Rick Rd.
Milford, NJ 08848-2110

Richard Rushforth
1701 BayIsle Drive
Point Pleasant, NJ 08742

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Richard Rushforth
1701 BayIsle Drive
Point Pleasant, NJ 08742

Thomas Koven
507 charlestown road
Hampton, NJ 08827

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Thomas Koven
507 charlestown road
Hampton, NJ 08827

Khalithea Skelly
113 14th st
Apt 8
Hoboken, NJ 07030-5545

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Khalithea Skelly
113 14th st
Apt 8
Hoboken, NJ 07030-5545

Anna Picinich
222 East Palisades Blvd.
Palisades Park, NJ 07650

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Anna Picinich
222 East Palisades Blvd.
Palisades Park, NJ 07650

Bennet Zurofsky
24 Bowdoin Street
Maplewood, NJ 07040-2702

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Bennet Zurofsky
24 Bowdoin Street
Maplewood, NJ 07040-2702

Michael Feeley
123 Hamilton Ave
Fords, NJ 08863

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Michael Feeley
123 Hamilton Ave
Fords, NJ 08863

Leslie Levin
1 Zeloof Dr
1 Zeloof Dr
Princeton Junction, NJ 08550

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Leslie Levin
1 Zeloof Dr
1 Zeloof Dr
Princeton Junction, NJ 08550

Seymour Brodsky
247 Burnside Place
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Seymour Brodsky
247 Burnside Place
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Chuck Slotkin
74 kent place blvd.
summit, NJ 07901

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Chuck Slotkin
74 kent place blvd.
summit, NJ 07901

John Richkus
206 Congress Street
Jersey City, NJ 07307

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

John Richkus
206 Congress Street
Jersey City, NJ 07307

Gina Bernstein
0-29 Hamlin Ct
Fair Lawn, NJ 07410-1014

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Gina Bernstein
0-29 Hamlin Ct
Fair Lawn, NJ 07410-1014

Claire Whitcomb
12 Fairwood Rd
Madison, NJ 07940

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Claire Whitcomb
12 Fairwood Rd
Madison, NJ 07940

Claire Whitcomb
12 Fairwood Rd
Madison, NJ 07940

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Claire Whitcomb
12 Fairwood Rd
Madison, NJ 07940

Eve Kirch
40 Conger St., 409 B
Bloomfield, NJ 07003

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Eve Kirch
40 Conger St., 409 B
Bloomfield, NJ 07003

Katy Fischer
4 Franklin Lane
Sussex, NJ 07461

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Katy Fischer
4 Franklin Lane
Sussex, NJ 07461

Christina Kuepper
73 Moore Ave
Waldwick, NJ 07463

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Christina Kuepper
73 Moore Ave
Waldwick, NJ 07463

Patrick Coyle
14 Ackerson Ave.
Pequannock, NJ 07440

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Patrick Coyle
14 Ackerson Ave.
Pequannock, NJ 07440

Susan Szewczuk
2 Sheffield Way
Clark, NJ 07066

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Susan Szewczuk
2 Sheffield Way
Clark, NJ 07066

lucy almeida
178 garner avenue
bloomfield, NJ 07003

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

lucy almeida
178 garner avenue
bloomfield, NJ 07003

Ellen Graham
24 Linden Avenue
Marlton, NJ 08053

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ellen Graham
24 Linden Avenue
Marlton, NJ 08053

Fred Mayer
15 Parkview Plaza
Morristown, NJ 07960

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Fred Mayer
15 Parkview Plaza
Morristown, NJ 07960

Linda Isham
1904 Palisade Ave, Unit 2
Union City, NJ 07087

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Linda Isham
1904 Palisade Ave, Unit 2
Union City, NJ 07087

Linda Isham
1904 Palisade Ave, Unit 2
Union City, NJ 07087

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Linda Isham
1904 Palisade Ave, Unit 2
Union City, NJ 07087

Lorelei Okun
265 Page Ave.
Lyndhurst, NJ 07071

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lorelei Okun
265 Page Ave.
Lyndhurst, NJ 07071

r vanstrien
25 independence blvd
warren, NJ 07059

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

r vanstrien
25 independence blvd
warren, NJ 07059

Brianne Helaudais
PO Box 43
Swartswood, NJ 07877

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Brianne Helaudais
PO Box 43
Swartswood, NJ 07877

Mr. Matthew Bader
112 River Edge Road
Bergenfield, NJ 07621

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Mr. Matthew Bader
112 River Edge Road
Bergenfield, NJ 07621

Carlos Ponomarciuc
Waldwick
Waldwick, NJ 07463

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Carlos Ponomarciuc
Waldwick
Waldwick, NJ 07463

Zorina Weber
111 So. Fullerton Ave.
Montclair, NJ 07042-2665

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Zorina Weber
111 So. Fullerton Ave.
Montclair, NJ 07042-2665

Carmen Dinescu
68 Sassafras Ct.
68 Sassafras Ct.
North Brunswick, NJ 08902

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Carmen Dinescu
68 Sassafras Ct.
68 Sassafras Ct.
North Brunswick, NJ 08902

Judith Caden
21 Glen Road
West Orange, NJ 07052

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Judith Caden
21 Glen Road
West Orange, NJ 07052

Roberta Siemering
614B Lake Point Drive
Lakewood, NJ 08701-7863

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Roberta Siemering
614B Lake Point Drive
Lakewood, NJ 08701-7863

Vincent Campanaro
4401 Spruce St
Philadelphia, PA 19104

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Vincent Campanaro
4401 Spruce St
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Muhammad Murtaza
152 County Avenue
Secaucus, NJ 07094

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Muhammad Murtaza
152 County Avenue
Secaucus, NJ 07094

Albert Behrens
221 Echelon Road, Apt. 6
Voorhees, NJ 08043-2019

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Albert Behrens
221 Echelon Road, Apt. 6
Voorhees, NJ 08043-2019

Elizabeth O'Connell
6 Queensberry Ln
Woodstown, NJ 08098

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Elizabeth O'Connell
6 Queensberry Ln
Woodstown, NJ 08098

Robin Fletcher
180 Baldwin St
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Robin Fletcher
180 Baldwin St
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Michela Colosimo
60 Oakhurst Lane
60 Oakhurst Lane
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Michela Colosimo
60 Oakhurst Lane
60 Oakhurst Lane
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054

Amanda Riley
73 Robertson Way
Lincoln Park, NJ 07035

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Amanda Riley
73 Robertson Way
Lincoln Park, NJ 07035

david cardillo
391 howe ave
passaic, NJ 07055

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

david cardillo
391 howe ave
passaic, NJ 07055

JESSE THOMPSON-ADAMS
917 SUMMERFIELD AVE
ASBURY PARK, NJ 07712-6415

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

JESSE THOMPSON-ADAMS
917 SUMMERFIELD AVE
ASBURY PARK, NJ 07712-6415

Todd Gast
174 Grand Street #4E
Jersey City, NJ 07302

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to produce Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Todd Gast
174 Grand Street #4E
Jersey City, NJ 07302

John Garrity
1034 Grant Ave
Collingswood, NJ 08107-2011

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

John Garrity
1034 Grant Ave
Collingswood, NJ 08107-2011

rosann guglielmo
6 tulip ct
park ridge, NJ 07656

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

rosann guglielmo
6 tulip ct
park ridge, NJ 07656

Dodris Carey
11 North Riding DRive
Cherry Hill, NJ 08003

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Dodris Carey
11 North Riding DRive
Cherry Hill, NJ 08003

Kate Walsh
40 South Fullerton Ave
Montclair, NJ 07042

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kate Walsh
40 South Fullerton Ave
Montclair, NJ 07042

Vikram Sikand
12 Liberty Place B2
B2
Weehawken, NJ 07086

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Vikram Sikand
12 Liberty Place B2
B2
Weehawken, NJ 07086

Rozanne Levine
110 Revere Court
Montville, NJ 07045-9011

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I personally avoid all food that is irradiated, if I can help it.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Rozanne Levine
110 Revere Court
Montville, NJ 07045-9011

myrna weinstein
311 walnut lane
mount laurel, NJ 08054

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

myrna weinstein
311 walnut lane
mount laurel, NJ 08054

Elizabeth Burke
492 Union Ave.
New Providence, NJ 07974

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public. This is unacceptable.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or the risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Burke
492 Union Ave.
New Providence, NJ 07974

Regina Cintron
7 Eastfield Dr
Wantage, NJ 07461

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Regina Cintron
7 Eastfield Dr
Wantage, NJ 07461

Cindy Kerekes
2 Lewis St
Wharton, NJ 07885

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Cindy Kerekes
2 Lewis St
Wharton, NJ 07885

michelle v
187 paterson ave
midland park, NJ 07432

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

michelle v
187 paterson ave
midland park, NJ 07432

Joseph Eschker
PO Box 167
Roebling, NJ 08554

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joseph Eschker
PO Box 167
Roebling, NJ 08554

Louis Dallara
3 Ohio Trail
Medford, NJ 08055

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Louis Dallara
3 Ohio Trail
Medford, NJ 08055

Philip Lipari
28 N. Lincoln Ave.
Colonia, NJ 07067-2326

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Philip Lipari
28 N. Lincoln Ave.
Colonia, NJ 07067-2326

JO DiLallo
223 Shippen St.
Weehawken, NJ 07086

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

JO DiLallo
223 Shippen St.
Weehawken, NJ 07086

Ronald Simonet
306 Balsam Ct
Howell, NJ 0731

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ronald Simonet
306 Balsam Ct
Howell, NJ 0731

Katarina Medakovich
17007 CPO way
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Katarina Medakovich
17007 CPO way
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Kenneth Kolanko
1230 Poplar Ave
Mountainside, NJ 07092

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kenneth Kolanko
1230 Poplar Ave
Mountainside, NJ 07092

Joann Ramos
Fiume St
Iselin, NJ 08830

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joann Ramos
Fiume St
Iselin, NJ 08830

Guillermo E. Ayala
29 East Fort Lee Road
Bogota, NJ 07603

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Guillermo E. Ayala
29 East Fort Lee Road
Bogota, NJ 07603

Sarah Woodhouse
1115 Clinton Terrace
South Plainfield, NJ 07080

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Sarah Woodhouse
1115 Clinton Terrace
South Plainfield, NJ 07080

Joseph Ponisciak
30 Nottingham Drive
Willingboro, NJ 08046

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Joseph Ponisciak
30 Nottingham Drive
Willingboro, NJ 08046

colleen keating
Franklin Ave
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

colleen keating
Franklin Ave
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Diane Woodhouse
1115 Clinton Terrace
South Plainfield, NJ 07080

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Diane Woodhouse
1115 Clinton Terrace
South Plainfield, NJ 07080

Irene Purdy
600 West 111 Street
New York, NY 10025

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Irene Purdy
600 West 111 Street
New York, NY 10025

William Wineburgh
22 Jill Ter
Succasunna, NJ 07876

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

William Wineburgh
22 Jill Ter
Succasunna, NJ 07876

Stephanie Williams
671 Hoes Lane
Piscataway, NJ 08855

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Stephanie Williams
671 Hoes Lane
Piscataway, NJ 08855

Ritu Harrison
45 Spruce Street
Princeton, NJ 08542

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ritu Harrison
45 Spruce Street
Princeton, NJ 08542

natalie sanchez
6035 Boulevard East
west New York, NJ 07093

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

natalie sanchez
6035 Boulevard East
west New York, NJ 07093

Terry Vaccaro
Corbett Pl
Plainfield, NJ 07060

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Terry Vaccaro
Corbett Pl
Plainfield, NJ 07060

lorraine brabham
1313 grand st
hoboken, NJ 07030

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

lorraine brabham
1313 grand st
hoboken, NJ 07030

Magdalena Najwer
54 Glassboro Road
Parsippany, NJ 07054

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Magdalena Najwer
54 Glassboro Road
Parsippany, NJ 07054

Mark Bek
42 redding cir
Princeton, NJ 08540

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Mark Bek
42 redding cir
Princeton, NJ 08540

Steve Pandolfo
91 Archangela Ave
Colonia, NJ 07067

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Steve Pandolfo
91 Archangela Ave
Colonia, NJ 07067

patricia tomeske
43 walter st
bloomfield, NJ 07003

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

patricia tomeske
43 walter st
bloomfield, NJ 07003

Sharon Rothe
18 Guilford Court
Morris Plains, NJ 07069

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Sharon Rothe
18 Guilford Court
Morris Plains, NJ 07069

Ann Domski
277 Front St.
Atco, NJ 08004

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Ann Domski
277 Front St.
Atco, NJ 08004

John Skrobe
264 Hamilton Avenue
Glen rock, NJ 07452

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

John Skrobe
264 Hamilton Avenue
Glen rock, NJ 07452

Maurice Kessler
500 Dorian Road
Westfield, NJ 07090

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiated food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Maurice Kessler
500 Dorian Road
Westfield, NJ 07090

kyra panchenko
73 bright street
jersey city, NJ 07302

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

kyra panchenko
73 bright street
jersey city, NJ 07302

Lynda Leibowitz
58 Plotts Rd.
Apt 3
Newton, NJ 07860

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Lynda Leibowitz
58 Plotts Rd.
Apt 3
Newton, NJ 07860

Patricia Fulmer
217 Dolores Dr
Cinnaminson, NJ 08077

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Patricia Fulmer
217 Dolores Dr
Cinnaminson, NJ 08077

Kimberly Drozd
481 Fairton-Millville Rd
Bridgeton, NJ 08302

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kimberly Drozd
481 Fairton-Millville Rd
Bridgeton, NJ 08302

Sol & Sharon Rothman
9 Fourth Street
Bergenfield, NJ 07621

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Sol & Sharon Rothman
9 Fourth Street
Bergenfield, NJ 07621

Jan-Paul Alon
5 Pebble Lane
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Jan-Paul Alon
5 Pebble Lane
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002

Susan McDonald
1246 Evergreen Dr
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Susan McDonald
1246 Evergreen Dr
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

Loretta Kaufman
72 Eighth Street
Belford, NJ 07718

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Loretta Kaufman
72 Eighth Street
Belford, NJ 07718

P J September
45 Lyons Place
Westwood, NJ 07675

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010.
This proposal should NOT be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety.
PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

PLEASE REJECT this proposal from PSEG for the good of humanity.
Sincerely,

P J September
45 Lyons Place
Westwood, NJ 07675

Laurel King
100 Route 33 West
Freehold, NJ 07728-2543

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Laurel King
100 Route 33 West
Freehold, NJ 07728-2543

Mary Sue g
27 garrow ave
pequannock, NJ 07440

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Mary Sue g
27 garrow ave
pequannock, NJ 07440

Phyllis Garr
20 Vernon Road
Marlboro, NJ 07746

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Phyllis Garr
20 Vernon Road
Marlboro, NJ 07746

Nancy Taiani
50 Gordonhurst ave
Montclair, NJ 07043

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to produce Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. This proposal should not be approved because:

1. It's safety is in question:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. There is a Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. The use of Cobalt-60 to irridate food is in question.
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs have met with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Nancy Taiani
50 Gordonhurst ave
Montclair, NJ 07043

Erica Brinker
25 Bedminster Rd
Randolph, NJ 07869

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Erica Brinker
25 Bedminster Rd
Randolph, NJ 07869

Frances Csikos
11 Tioga Avenue
Lake Hiawatha, NJ 07034

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Frances Csikos
11 Tioga Avenue
Lake Hiawatha, NJ 07034

Don Angelini
110 Inlet Ave.
Apt. 2
Manahawkin, NJ 08050

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Don Angelini
110 Inlet Ave.
Apt. 2
Manahawkin, NJ 08050

Terence Major
P.O. Box 404
Atco, NJ 08004

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Terence Major
P.O. Box 404
Atco, NJ 08004

patty metz
one scenic drive
#1101
highlands, NJ 07732

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

patty metz
one scenic drive
#1101
highlands, NJ 07732

Chief, Rulemaking and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Kevin Diggs
284 St. Cloud Ave
West Orange, NJ 07052

Chief, Rulemaking and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Barbara A. Gotti
300 Broadway
#D1
Westville, NJ 08093

Chief, Rulemaking and Directives Branch
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the proposal by PSEG to start a pilot project to product Cobalt-60 at the Hope Creek Generating Station as published on page 9445 of the Federal Register /Vol. 75, No. 40 /Tuesday, March 2, 2010. There are several reasons that this proposal should not be approved:

1. Safety:
The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has reported that the Hope Creek Facility had instances of "ineffective problem evaluations and untimely, ineffective corrective solutions," with a "willingness to defer needed maintenance." The company was also found to prioritize production over safety. PSEG's record shows that this plant should be focused on improving safety procedures for its existing operations, not expanding to create new ones.

2. Transportation Risk:
The goal of the proposed project is to create Cobalt-60 that could be used in locations other than the plant at Hope Creek. This would require the Cobalt-60 to be shipped to these other facilities, opening up an entirely new pathway for accidents or radiation exposure to the public.

3. Demand for Cobalt-60
One potential use for Cobalt-60 is to irradiate food. But despite years of industry efforts to promote its use, irradiate food has been roundly rejected by consumers, with numerous test market efforts and attempts to include irradiated food in federal nutrition programs meeting with failure. The food irradiation industry is not viable enough to justify creating new projects at Hope Creek or risks from transporting Cobalt-60 long distances.

I urge you to reject this proposal from PSEG.
Sincerely,

Doris Carey
11 North Riding Drive
Cherry Hill, NJ 08003