

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: December 09, 2014
Received: December 06, 2014
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1jy-8fwi-hyrw
Comments Due: December 06, 2014
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2014-0149
Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site

Comment On: NRC-2014-0149-0008
Early Site Permit for the PSEG Site; Extension of Comment Period

Document: NRC-2014-0149-DRAFT-0024
Comment on FR Doc # 2014-26301

RECEIVED

2014 DEC -9 PM 2:18

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
UNIT

Submitter Information

Name: Gary Slack

8/22/2014

General Comment

79FR 49820

(22)

Dear NRC,

I strongly oppose providing an early site permit for PSEG at the Salem location. I also strongly oppose additional nuclear reactors at the Salem location.

Nuclear power may seem clean, but rarely do people factor in the spent radioactive rods that have to be stored for decades and decades, and are extremely hazardous. There's also the chance of a partial or full meltdown, which would be a catastrophe given the large population in the Wilmington/Philadelphia region. Trying to evacuate the region would be a nightmare and there would be great loss of life.

The states of New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania can have a needed power supply other than nuclear, they just have to support and invest in solar, wind, and water power. Even natural gas would be an easily obtainable source for power needs. It may seem easier to just keep with nuclear or coal power, but these are not acceptable sources for the near or distant future.

Also needing to be factored in are rising sea levels. Salem is along the Delaware River, and vulnerable to future flooding as climate change raises sea levels.

There are many reasons why Salem should not get this permit and should not open additional nuclear reactors. I hope that you will consider these and decide not to issue this permit.

Sincerely,
Gary Slack
Wilmington, DE

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM - 013
E-RIDS = ADM -03
Add =

A. Feller (Aht)