

DOCKET NUMBER PR 50 (94)  
PROPOSED RULE (53 FR 16435)

MARSHALL G. MOORE  
273 LOCUST STREET  
DANVERS, MASS. 01923

DOCKETED  
JUN 2 1988

May 25, 1988

'88 JUN -2 P7:26

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
DOCKETING SERVICE  
BRANCH

Dear Sirs:

The Massachusetts politicians who are opposed to the Pilgrim and Seabrook power plants are in no way competent to make risk evaluations for these facilities. They readily admit this, but maintain that they rely on technical advisors for their policy. However, their objections to nuclear energy are really based on the perception that it will make them popular with the voters, and the so called technical advisors are carefully chosen to conform to those ideas.

There is no chance of getting an unbiased cost-risk-benefit analysis in the climate that exists here today because the politicians have much more access to the news media than does the technical community. I have written six letters to the Boston newspapers explaining that the start-up of Seabrook would cause the retirement of several old, less efficient plants, and even detailing how many less tons of the various stack gases would be put into the atmosphere. None of these have ever been printed.

But nearly every day there is a pronouncement by Sharon Pollard, the Massachusetts energy commissioner. First she said that Seabrook should be converted to coal. Then, apparently having been told that this was impossible, she advocated building a gas burning plant and even entered into discussions with possible suppliers of gas. A few months later she proclaimed that Canadian import power would solve our problems. Currently she maintains that no new power supplies are needed if conservation measures are adopted and the peaks are modified by life-style changes.

It is to be hoped that the NRC will not be influenced by these outpourings from the Massachusetts State House. All reasonable steps to speed the licensing process for Pilgrim and Seabrook should be undertaken. The first of these is certainly the issuing of the low power license in advance of sirens and complete evacuation planning.

I have no financial or any other interest in the companies that run these plants and am writing only because I think that nuclear power is the most environmentally acceptable way of generating electricity.

Very truly yours,

*M G Moore*

M.G. Moore,  
Prof. Engr. Mass Reg 3327  
Tel 617-774-0043

8806140247 880525  
PDR PR PDR  
50 53FR16435

MARSHALL G. MOORE  
273 LOCUST STREET  
DANVERS, MASS. 01923

Dec. 2 1987

To The Editor - Boston Globe

Dear Sir:

As the most influential paper in the region the Globe has a responsibility to present news and views impartially. The political news seems to be presented in an evenhanded way, but the same cannot be said for the discussions on nuclear power and the energy supply in general. The Editors, because of their unreasonable bias against nuclear power, are allowing the writer Larry Tye and columnist David Nyhan to print misleading and false statements about the New England bulk power supply situation.

In the first place neither these writers or their quoted sources (Gov. Dukakis, James Shannon, Sharon Pollard, Paul Levy, and his successor) have the technical ability to evaluate the cost - risk - benefits of various power sources. In fact, until recently the sources given most credibility in your paper were those dreamers who said "we do not need more power supplies - just conservation and more efficient use of what we have"; in our industry this is called 'the electric tooth brush syndrome'.

A person who got all his information on nuclear power from your paper would think that:

- Nuclear plants are bombs which sooner or later will go the Chernobyl route.
- The reactor vessels have serious flaws that the owners and operators are trying to conceal.
- Pilgrim operators spend the day with games and magazines instead of minding the reactor.
- Seabrook is full of faulty welds because the weldors were drunk and/or drugged.
- The safety of the Commonwealth was seriously compromised because a guard left his gun in the washroom for a few minutes.

The list is endless. The most trivial negative development is trumpeted in large headlines (even though the text often contradicts the headline), while favorable ones are ignored or relegated to small type below the fold.

The same bias applies to letters accepted for publication. There have some recent ones against nuclear power that contained serious errors of fact. However, this is the fifth letter that I have sent you this year in support of nuclear power and none have been printed.

Those of us who believe that (with the possible exception of hydro projects) nuclear energy is the safest and least polluting way of generating power should be allowed the chance to comment on the subject.

Very truly yours,

*Marshall G. Moore*

Marshall Moore, Consulting Engineer  
Tel 774-0043

MARSHALL G. MOORE  
273 LOCUST STREET  
DANVERS, MASS. 01923

Nov. 28, 1987

To The Editor - Boston Globe

Dear Sir:

Governor Dukakis and other Massachusetts politicians, posing as engineering experts, are in favor of dumping into the air 580 tons per day of carbon dioxide plus an indeterminate quantity of NOx (mixed oxides of nitrogen). This would be the stack discharge of the 1150 MW gas burning plant that they propose to replace Seabrook. This atmospheric pollution would be the equivalent (but without the traffic) of 15,000 additional cars on the streets.

The deleterious effect of CO<sub>2</sub> in the air is described in an article on page 32 of the December 'Scientific American' from which the following quotation is taken:

'The concentration of carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere is increasing at a rate of 0.4% each year, primarily because of the combustion of fossil fuels. Carbon dioxide is a 'greenhouse gas'- it traps heat from the earth's surface that would otherwise be radiated into space. Its continuing increase is expected to cause a global warming, so understanding its role in climate has assumed much importance . . .'

There are two principal reasons why Seabrook was built as a nuclear plant:

- To build a plant that is completely non-polluting.
- Uranium fuel is considerably cheaper than fossil fuel so that despite the higher initial cost, there was the prospect of furnishing cheaper base load power.

The cost advantage has been somewhat eroded by delays caused by obstructionists and the prolonged licensing process. Also, at least a billion dollars has been spent on unnecessary safety equipment installed just to placate the obstructionists and environmentalists.

The nuclear plant is the safest and least polluting way to generate electricity and should be given a full power license at once. If Dukakis and Shannon are determined to protect the people from all risks (although it is more likely that they are just showboating) it would be more sensible to:

- Shut down the MBTA because of the third rail hazard and the danger of tunnel fires.
- Forbid airplanes to fly over or land in Massachusetts.
- Enforce strict separation of the races to avoid riots and fights.
- Limit automobiles to 15 miles per hour.
- Forbid the sale or use of ladders.

Very truly yours

*Marshall G. Moore*

Marshall G. Moore, Consulting Engineer  
Tel. 774-0043

PS. Will you also please print the enclosed letter that I have sent to Mr. Shannon. He has kindly given permission for its release.