

The Engineering Magazine of Power Gereration

\*82,304 South Greve Aven Barrington, IL 60010 312-381-1840 DOCUMENTAL BRANCH (19) (19) (46 FR 61484)

January 15, 1982

Secretary of the Commission Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Docket and Service Branch

Dear Sir:

Re: Docket PRM-50-30

Petitioner's first alternative is that the OL expire 40 years from the date of issuance. This is a logical improvement over the present procedure wherein the licensee is faced with the possibility of an abnormally shortened plant life. The capital cost of a nuclear plant is high enough these days that neither the utility nor the nation can afford to lose any of its operating years.

I am strongly in favor of the petitioner's first alternative.

Sincerely,

Udric C. aldo

Fredric C. Olds Senior Editor

FCO:jh

5. Felton

8201230011 820118 PDR PRM 50-30 PDR Technical Publishing The Dunk Bradstreet Corporation

Actinow Actiged by card . 1/21/82 emp

'82 JAN 18 A11:33

cemy

(46 FR 61484)

January <sup>5</sup>13<sup>%</sup>C<sup>H</sup>1982

DOCKET NUMBER

Secretary of the Commission U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Weshington, D.C. 20555

ATTENTION: Docket and Service Branch

Gentlemen:

I strongly support the petition, Docket No. PRM-50-30, filed by the Council on Energy Independence. I feel it is in the best interest of the general public to amend the regulations described in 10 CFR Part 50.

As a mechanical engineer working with technology daily, I view the option of nuclear power as a must. Therefore, I strongly support the proposal to amend Section 50.51 such that the expiration date of the Operating License (OL) is tied to the date of the operating license issuance and not to the date of the Construction Permit (CP) issuance.

I appreciate, very much, the opportunity to express my opinions on this subject to the commission and look forward to your decision.

Sincerely,

Gary J. Schweitzer 756 W. Algonquin Rd. #8 Des Plaines, IL 60016

DSII AND: J. Feltow

Actiniumedged by and 1/27/82 eng

-----

1489 Blackburn Street Wheaton, Illinois 60187 January 14, 1982 '82 JAN 18 AU1:33

(46 FR 61484)

Subject: Docket No. PRM-50-30

CPF LE DE BLOCE DOCKETING & SERVIS BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555 ATTN: Docket and Service Branch

Dear Sir:

We become smarter everyday. As new knowledge is discovered, we must constantly reevaluate the consistency of this knowledge with the accepted principles, natural and legal, that govern our lives. Clearly the proliferation of nuclear regulations which began in the late 1970's and accelerated following the event at Three Mile Island had a single purpose: the assessment of current practice to assure that the "public health and safety" requirements of loCFR20, loCFR50 and loCFR100 are not degraded in the light of new knowledge.

The implementation of these new regulations has had a major impact in two areas of nuclear power plant operation: 1). the plants are safer than ever before and 2). the construction time of 1970. Therefore, today's nuclear industry is required to build a plant which is safer than any ever built at a cost significantly higher than any ever built and then operate the plant for a <u>shorter</u> time than any ever built. This, I contend, is "cruel and unusual punishment." A reassessment of the operating life of a nuclear power plant is clearly in order.

Therefore, I express my support of the subject petition for rule making. In particular, I believe that "Alternative 1" of the petition will restore the operating life of nuclear power plants to the period intended by the original statutes as established by the Commission. In addition, "Alternative 1" will be a major impetus in restoring to the nuclear power industry the economic viability which has been so severely erroded by inflation.

If I can be of further assistance in this matter, please contact me at the above address.

D5/1 ADD: J. Folton

Yours very truly,

W. R. Peebles, PhD., PE

and reason by and 1/21/82 emp

WRP:ljr