

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

(46 FR 18045)

PR. 50

(17)

4327 Alconbury #3
Houston, TX 77021
April 10, 1981

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

Dear Sir:

I submit the following comment on the proposed rule listed in the Federal Register on March 23, 1981 regarding "Licensing Requirements for Pending Construction Permit and Manufacturing License Applications" (10 CFR Part 50).

There are no rational reasons I know of why Offshore Power Systems, Inc. should not be held to the same containment standards as the rest of the industry. To the contrary, the impact upon the environment and human health of a failure containment in a marine setting would be even greater than a similar event on terra firma.

While not entirely conversant on OPS' plans, the marine siting of a nuclear generating station might lull the corporation into a complacent "If it melts now, it'll be dissipated by tomorrow" attitude. That kind of irresponsibility is dangerous, and for that reason, I'd rather see only land-based plants of this type (fission). I think we will be able to monitor them much better on dry land. And they do need monitoring.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Robert Alexander

Robert Alexander



8104280 717

L-4-1, A-50

10
DOCKET NUMBER PR-50
PROPOSED RULE
46 FR 18045

April 3, 1981



To The NRC.,

I am very much opposed to the proposal imposing an arbitrary time limit on the licensing of Nuclear Power Plants. The decision to license a plant affects a great number of people, and so requires the utmost consideration.

I feel this time limit would undermine your effectiveness as a regulatory agency, and is extremely unfair to the public as well.

Sincerely,



Jane J. Carter
303 Wilson Ave.
Blackburg, VA
24060

L-4-17450