

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE

PR - 44 FR 75167

(141)

March 3, 1980

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

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

Dear Sir:

I have been reviewing the Proposed Rules for emergency planning for the NRC, specifically Alternatives A& B. I feel that the Commission's recognizing the equivalence of emergency planning to siting and design rather than being secondary is a plausible decision. However there are areas of these alternatives that need to be more stringent than as proposed. I feel that no exemptions to license applicants should be given until these emergency response plans are deemed adequate, not only by the NRC and local government agencies, but also that the emergency response plans can be demonstrated to be practically implemented by the public involved.

It is my feeling, and many others, that the NRC has used poor judgement in issuing a construction permit to the Philadelphia Electric Company to construct it's nuclear facility at Limerick, Penna. I feel that the only way the Commission can regain any credibility is to reconsider this action. This plant is sited in the third most densely populated area for a 10 mile radius in the United States and is sited the closest to a metropolitan area--Philadelphia, which is 21 miles away. It is overall less than 50% complete- Unit 1 is 55% complete and Unit 2 is 35% complete. Continuing this construction and issuing an operating license to Philadelphia Electric Co. will only enhance the "greenlight organization" image of the Commission for the nuclear industry. I would appreciate your response to my comments. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Malcolm H. Smith

Marlene G. Seidts
W. 7 State Rd.
Phoenixville, Pa.
19360

P.S.

I am sending this as a let entry comment.

Acknowledged by card... *dlh*



8004100006