

**From:** wdunn302@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 03, 2009 11:55 AM  
**To:** Ashley, Donnie  
**Cc:** Bill Dunn  
**Subject:** Comments On Salem and Hope Creek License Application

William R Dunn  
Elsmere, Delaware  
September 3, 2009

Donnie Ashley, Project Manager  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear regulatory Commission, Mail Stop 011-F1  
Washington, DC 20555  
301-415-3191

Reference:

LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION  
Hope Creek Generating Station  
Facility Operating License No. NPF-57

LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION  
Salem Nuclear Generating Station  
Unit 1 Facility Operating License No. DPR-70  
Unit 2 Facility Operating License No. DPR-75

Dear Mr. Ashely,

As a former management consultant for a number of EPA 208 Water Quality Area-Wide pollution control programs, I am very much interested in reviewing projects that may have a significant impact on the environment as well as the need to sustain a reliable physical infrastructure that supports our economy and standard of living. Having also worked in Haiti as a consultant, I experienced first hand routine electrical blackouts, an unreliable turn-of-the-ninetieth century telephone system, and other infrastructure shortcomings for drinking water and transportation. We take the safety and reliable delivery of these type services for granted in the United States. Electrical generation is the critical infrastructure component that the rest of the economy depends.

I have reviewed the applications for both the Hope Creek and Salem nuclear facilities and would make the following comments:

Hope Creek and Salem Applications

*SUSCO Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013*

*FRIDS = ADM-03  
Call = J. SUSCO (JJS1)*

RECEIVED

2009 AUG 12 PM 4:11

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
LIC/RPC

The environmental impact appears to be minimal for granting an extension of the facilities license and there is certainly a justified need to upgrade portions of nuclear power generating operations to replace aging equipment that will improve the power generating capabilities and mitigate safety issues of an aging plant.

Secondly, nuclear power does not produce greenhouse gas (CO<sub>2</sub>) and consequently would be a more attractive alternative to burning coal or natural gas.

Third, based on my research on the emerging nuclear fusion technology, the disposal of nuclear waste will be one day be safely transmuted to useful isotopes. Nuclear fusion and fission will be paired to provide almost unlimited power without the issue of residual radioactivity.

Fourth, the option of purchasing more electricity by de-commissioning these facilities will likely require modifying and building additional transmission lines to support this option. This will have a far more deleterious affect on the environment and communities where these lines will be constructed than continuing to operating these nuclear facilities. Furthermore, importing electricity will likely originate from either coal or gas fired units that produced the greenhouse gases CO<sub>2</sub> (and other pollutants) as compared to nuclear power that generates zero greenhouse gas.

#### Recommendation

I endorse the granting of these facilities a license extension for the aforementioned reasons and would further recommend that these sites be replaced with new state of the art nuclear power plants that would have additional electrical generating capacity. Nuclear power has proven to be a reliable and cost-effective source of electricity and would provide the basis for pairing with nuclear fusion technology in approximately 20 years that would meet our countries energy needs as well as safeguard our environment.

Please feel free to contact me if you require additional information or comment.

Very truly yours,

William R Dunn