



# State of New Hampshire

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### CONCORD

#### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND AGRICULTURE

GREENE, ELIZABETH A., Chairman  
SCAMMAN, W. DOUGLAS JR., Vice Chairman  
ROGERS, MYRTLE B., Clerk  
BLAKENEY, GORDON R. JR.  
BOWLER, BARBARA B.  
CAMPBELL, MARILYN B.  
CATE, GEORGE H.  
CATE, JOHN O.  
CORSER, JOHN B.  
DONOVAN, FRANCIS X.  
FISHER, MARK  
GIBBONS, PAUL A.  
HAYNES, BRADLEY  
JAMROG, JOHN F.  
KOZACKA, FRANK J.  
LACAILLADE, MARGARET  
LOFRANCO, JACK  
NELSON, RALPH E.  
PEVEAR, ROBERTA C.  
TROMBLY, RICKY A.  
WHEELER, EMMA B.

Drinkwater Road  
Hampton Falls, N. H.  
03844

June 6, 1979

The Honorable Joseph Hendrie, Chairman  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Sir:

Enclosed is copy of a telegram which I sent to President Carter, Senators Durkin and Humphrey, Representatives D'Amours and Cleveland, and Gov. Hugh Gallen. Also enclosed are copies of two public statements I have made.

All of these messages were conveyed at the request of a majority of my constituents.

I have also been asked to advise you that the people of Hampton Falls and Hampton DEMAND a moratorium on nuclear power stations, INCLUDING HALTING THE SEABROOK NUCLEAR PLANT NOW UNDER CONSTRUCTION!!

My family and I live TWO MILES FROM THE PROPOSED SEABROOK PLANT, which is situated directly on the Atlantic Ocean. There has NEVER BEEN AN EVACUATION PLAN submitted to any of the residents in the five mile "DEAD" zone (of which we are a part), or any of the citizens of the other "zones" surrounding this proposed plant.

Since we are backed up to the ocean, and a wind coming off the water would blow any contamination toward any "escape" routes, it appears there would be no way we could be evacuated during much of the time.

It is my understanding that the reason the residents in Pennsylvania were not evacuated was that the wind had shifted, and they "DID NOT KNOW WHICH WAY TO RUN", as shown in the transcripts during the crisis.

I cannot comprehend how you can allow construction of this plant to continue, when you know the dangers not only to the thousands of area residents from Portland, Maine, to Boston, Mass., and beyond, and west to Concord, N. H., and beyond, but also to the 100,000 people who gather on the beaches in the summer.

595 329


7908090422

It is unbelievable that you continue to allow the building of these plants even in areas of less population with no evacuation plans, and no means of disposing of the wastes.

If, as it appears, you care nothing for humanity, perhaps the dollar value of the loss of material things is important to you. If that is the case, I am sure you are aware the costs could be tremendous. I am enclosing a copy of an article by Jack Anderson on this subject.

Again, my constituents DEMAND that you immediately discontinue the building of the Seabrook Nuclear Plant. Just one of these units will be the largest in the world, and they propose to build two of them. We also ask for a moratorium on ALL Nuclear Plants.

Sincerely,



Rep. Roberta C. Pevear  
Rockingham District #12

Enc.

Drinkwater Road  
Hampton Falls, N. H.  
03844

May 22, 1979

Senator Gordon Humphrey  
U. S. Senate Office Building  
Washington, D. C.  
20510

Dear Senator Humphrey,

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to Harold Denton, together with copy of my letter addressed to John Ahearn, with attachments, at the NRC. This same letter has been sent to each member of the NRC and to the EPA Director.

The people of the Seacoast have consistently voted against the Seabrook Nuclear Plant in the past, and are now demanding that action be taken to protect them and their homes and children from the possibility of a Three-Mile-Island-accident.

I trust that those who have been elected to act in their behalf will see that they are protected.

Sincerely yours,

Rep. Roberta C. Pevear  
Rockingham District #12

Enc.

595 331

Drinkwater Road  
Hampton Falls, N. H.  
03844

May 22, 1979

The Honorable Harold Denton  
Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Sir:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I have sent to the EPA and NRC, together with attachments. I am also sending copies to President Carter, Senators Durkin and Humphrey, Representatives D'Amours and Cleveland, and Gov. Hugh Gallen.

I have been asked by my constituents to advise you and each of the above that we support the Seacoast Anti-Pollution League's Show Cause Request to require an evacuation plan for the ten-mile area around the Seabrook plant. It is also interesting to note that the population in this area exceeds the NRC's own guidelines for the siting of nuclear plants.

As stated in the enclosed letter, it is incomprehensible to me how the construction of the Seabrook plant continues when there is no evacuation plan in sight, particularly after the Three Mile Island evacuation fiasco.

Please, please do what you can to protect us!

Sincerely,

Rep. Roberta C. Pevear  
Rockingham District #12

Enc.

595 332



# State of New Hampshire

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### CONCORD

#### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND AGRICULTURE

GREENE, ELIZABETH A., Chairman  
SCAMMAN, W. DOUGLAS JR., Vice Chairman  
ROGERS, MYRTLE B., Clerk  
BLAKENEY, GORDON R. JR.  
BOWLER, BARBARA B.  
CAMPBELL, MARILYN B.  
CATE, GEORGE H.  
CATE, JOHN O.  
CORSER, JOHN B.  
DONOVAN, FRANCIS X.  
FISHER, MARK  
GIBBONS, PAUL A.  
HAYNES, BRADLEY  
JAMROG, JOHN F.  
KOZACKA, FRANK J.  
LACAILLADE, MARGARET  
LoFRANCO, JACK  
NELSON, RALPH E.  
PEVEAR, ROBERTA C.  
TROMBLY, RICKY A.  
WHEELER, EMMA B.

Drinkwater Road  
Hampton Falls, N. H.  
03844

May 11, 1979

The Honorable Douglas Costle  
Administrator, EPA  
Waterside Mall  
Washington, D. C. S.E.  
20500

Sir:

Enclosed is copy of a telegram which I sent to President Carter, Senators Durkin and Humphrey, Representatives D'Amours and Cleveland, and Gov. Hugh Gallen. Also enclosed are copies of two public statements I have made.

All of these messages were conveyed at the request of a majority of my constituents.

I have also been asked to advise you that the people of Hampton Falls and Hampton DEMAND a moratorium on nuclear power stations, INCLUDING HALTING THE SEABROOK NUCLEAR PLANT NOW UNDER CONSTRUCTION!!

My family and I live TWO MILES FROM THE PROPOSED SEABROOK PLANT, which is situated directly on the Atlantic Ocean. There has NEVER BEEN AN EVACUATION PLAN submitted to any of the residents in the five mile "DEAD" zone (of which we are a part), or any of the citizens of the other "zones" surrounding this proposed plant.

Since we are backed up to the ocean, and a wind coming off the water would blow any contamination toward any "escape" routes, it appears there would be no way we could be evacuated during much of the time.

595 333

It is my understanding that the reason the residents in Pennsylvania were not evacuated was that the wind had shifted, and they "DID NOT KNOW WHICH WAY TO RUN", as shown in the transcripts during the crisis..


I cannot comprehend how you can allow construction of this plant to continue, when you know the dangers not only to the thousands of area residents from Portland, Maine, to Boston, Mass., and beyond, and west to Concord, N. H., and beyond, but also to the 100,000 people who gather on the beaches in the summer.

It is unbelievable that you continue to allow the building of these plants even in areas of less population with no evacuation plans, and no means of disposing of the wastes.

If, as it appears, you care nothing for humanity, perhaps the dollar value of the loss of material things is important to you. If that is the case, I am sure you are aware the costs could be tremendous. I am enclosing a copy of an article by Jack Anderson on this subject.

Again, my constituents DEMAND that you immediately discontinue the building of the Seabrook Nuclear Plant. Just one of these units will be the largest in the world, and they propose to build two of them. We also ask for a moratorium on ALL Nuclear Plants.

Sincerely,



Rep. Roberta C. Pevear  
Rockingham District #12

Enc.

595 334

MAILGRAM - 4/1/79

TO: PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER, THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON 20500  
SEN. GORDON HUMPHREY, U. S. SENATE, " 20510  
SEN. JOHN DURKIN, " " " " "  
REP. NORMAN D'AMOURS, U. S. CONGRESS, " 20515  
REP. JAMES CLEVELAND, " " " " "  
GOV. HUGH GALLEN, STATE HOUSE, CONCORD, N. H. 03301

AS A REPRESENTATIVE ELECTED TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE OF HAMPTON  
AND HAMPTON FALLS, N. H., IN THE N. H. LEGISLATURE, AND A RESI-  
DENT OF HAMPTON FALLS, RESIDING TWO MILES FROM THE PROPOSED  
SEABROOK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, I DEMAND THAT CONSTRUCTION OF  
THE SEABROOK PLANT BE STOPPED IMMEDIATELY.

IT IS THE FEELING OF A MAJORITY OF MY CONSTITUENTS THAT THE  
PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECTED TO THE DANGERS  
NOW BEING EXPERIENCED IN PENNSYLVANIA.

ROBERTA C. PEVEAR, REPRESENTATIVE  
DRINKWATER ROAD, HAMPTON FALLS, N. H. 03844



I'd like to read the following Mailgram dated 4/1/79, sent to Pres. Jimmy Carter, Sens. Gordon Humphrey and John Durkin, Reps. Norman D'Amours and James Cleveland, and Gov. Hugh Gallen...

(from original copy)

In addition, I'd like to state that in 1977 the Town of Hampton Falls voted by ballot vote of more than 2/3's to "request the selectmen to obtain from Public Service Co. an evacuation plan for the Town of Hampton Falls".

As of this date, no such plan has been received.

On the front page of today's MANCHESTER UNION, an area resident is quoted: (Lee Smith, an Internal Revenue Service employee) "I don't think we are talking about X-rays here or a coal mine cave-in that kills a few people. You can't draw those analogies. We're talking about hundreds of thousands of people being affected, maybe years from now." The Article goes on to say: Among those who could be affected if a similar disaster struck Seabrook, are the estimated 100,000 people who visit local beaches on summer weekends. No evacuation plan has been designed for them because of the few roads serving beach areas.

Another article in that same paper, datelined Harrisburg, Pa., states: "Defense officials were drafting contingency plans to get tens of thousands out of the area..."

There was no evacuation plan in place prior to the accident, and, if what could have happened had happened, there would be no time to make up their minds which way to run. We in the Seacoast DEMAND a halt to Nuclear Power Plants, including the proposed Seabrook Plant!!



I'd like to read the following Mailgram dated 4/1/79, sent to Pres. Jimmy Carter, Sens. Gordon Humphrey and John Durkin, Reps. Norman D'Amours and James Cleveland, and Gov. Hugh Gallen...

(from original copy)

In addition, I'd like to state that in 1977 the Town of Hampton Falls voted by ballot vote of more than 2/3's to "request the selectmen to obtain from Public Service Co. an evacuation plan for the Town of Hampton Falls".

As of this date, no such plan has been received.

On page 8 of yesterday's PORTSMOUTH HERALD, an article entitled, "THREE MILE TRANSCRIPTS SHOW OFFICIALS 'IN THE BLIND' FOR DAYS", states:

"In a meeting March 31, Roger J. Mattson, NRC director of systems safety, told the commissioners bluntly: 'No plant has ever been in this condition, no plant has ever been tested in this condition, no plant has ever been analyzed in this condition in the history of this program...'

Mattson was one of at least three staff members who, on March 30, were urging a precautionary evacuation of the area downwind from Three Mile Island, some 10 miles south of Harrisburg, Pa. But the commission did not recommend it, partly because the wind was shifting erratically and nobody could be sure which way 'downwind' would be when people moved out".

My question is this... If we on the N. H. Seacoast should happen to have a North East wind at the time an evacuation should become necessary, is there anyone who can guarantee us that the waters will open and let us pass? Although those who have assured us that nuclear power is safe give the impression that they are gods, I doubt they could pull this off.

Rep. Roberta C. Pevear

Rockingham District #12

Jack Anderson

# Three Mile Island debate

WASHINGTON — The experts are still arguing over the long-range health effects of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, and it will be years before their educated guesses are proven right or wrong.

But one thing is already clear: If the Harrisburg area, or any other community near a nuclear power plant, had been exposed to a full blown nuclear disaster, it would have meant financial ruin for thousands of residents.

The reason: Federal law sets a limit on insurance compensation for nuclear accidents, and the limit is ridiculously low.

The Price-Anderson Act of 1957 sets the compensation limit for any one accident at \$560 million. And because the law requires the nuclear industry to purchase all available insurance coverage, individual homeowners cannot buy any nuclear insurance to supplement the \$560 million maximum provided by the 1957 act.

Here's how this inequitable insurance compensation might have worked out in the Three Mile Island situation, according to an internal study prepared by the Federal Insurance Administration:

Assuming that serious radiation is confined to a 20-mile radius, 200,000 dwellings worth an average of \$50,000 each would be rendered permanently unfit to live in. Adding in an estimated \$5,000 in relocation expenses and \$12,500 in personal property loss for each family, plus damage to area businesses, the total loss would amount to 16.8 billion.

The study also assumed that people would be evacuated and no medical expenses or damages would be incurred.

The average family, losing a total of \$67,500, would get just \$2,247 out of the \$560 million kitty. This would amount to just over 3 cents of compensation for every dollar loss.

Assuming a less severe disaster, the federal actuaries estimated a "moderate" loss of \$7.6 billion. In that scenario, the residents would get about 7 and one-half cents for each dollar of loss, or \$4,996 for their home, its contents and extra living expenses.

In addition, the federal study notes: Under the Price-Anderson Act, "an absolute limit for filing claims of 20 years applies. Cancer incidence which develops beyond 20 years is not covered."

It's not as if the pathetic inadequacy of nuclear-accident insurance coverage hasn't been known to government officials and Congress. Study after study has shown that potential property damage would be well up in the billions of dollars.

Even before passage of Price-Anderson, a 1967 Atomic Energy Commission study estimated damage at \$7 billion in a full-scale nuclear accident. Seven years later, another government report set the figure at anywhere from \$17 billion to \$230 billion. A more conservative federal study in 1975 still predicted a loss of \$14 billion.

Three years ago, an insurance industry task force concluded it was technically feasible to set up a "homeowners insurance pool." However, the experts decided against recommending this move because, among other reasons, it "would

in effect reduce" the amount of coverage that could be "purchased by a facility owner."

But the insurance purchased by facility owner would likely be used to cover his own losses first. The system appears to be designed, therefore, more to protect the industry than the homeowner.

POOR ORIGINAL

595 339