



THE ASSEMBLY
STATE OF NEW YORK
ALBANY

'82 M 17 P2:01

JOHN L. BEHAN
1ST ASSEMBLY DISTRICT
THE PLAZA
P. O. BOX 1005
MONTAUK, NEW YORK 11954
ROOM 523
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12248

RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
SUB-COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS
REAL PROPERTY TAXATION COMMITTEE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION COMMITTEE
HOUSE OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
TOURISM, SPORTS & ARTS COMMITTEE

May 7, 1982

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street North West
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Commission Members:

In addressing the possible licensing of Shoreham, two important aspects must be considered: need and safety.

In examining the question of safety, it is not enough to look at only the needs of those within the 10 mile area of the proposed evacuation plan. The fate of all 180,000 residents of the East End is very much at stake. I maintain that under such a proposal the residents of the South and the East of the area included in the evacuation plan, would be helpless in the face of a nuclear accident. The 10 mile circle (which includes five miles of water) would be completely unworkable in view of the unique placement of the Shoreham plant, since it effectively cuts off Eastern Suffolk. Residents would not be afforded the opportunity to move west to escape radiation; rather, they would be caught in a vice between radiation and the ocean.

DSOB
S1/0

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

May 7, 1982

Recently LILCO Vice President Ira Freilicher addressed state lawmakers representing Suffolk and Nassau Counties, attempting to explain why the utility believes that the evacuation plan is satisfactory. At that time, Freilicher made the statement that the people who live near Shoreham should escape danger during an emergency by heading East. This is not satisfactory. Until a comprehensive evacuation plan is developed that takes into account the location of the plant and the needs of all Eastern Suffolk residents, I will continue to oppose this plan vigorously. I have introduced legislation in the Assembly which would require the state Public Service Commission to provide technical and other support assistance to any municipality in the state in the preparation of plans for evacuation in cases of nuclear accidents. The legislation would also mandate that the plans include the creation of a "secondary ingestion zone" of fifty miles to prevent contamination of water and food sources. Topography, wind patterns, and road capacities of areas affected by a possible nuclear accident, would also have to be taken into account in the development of emergency evacuation plans.

The people of Long Island have lost confidence in the ability of LILCO's management to make the decisions that will affect us all. The suggestion to evacuate to the North and South Forks, is just one example of the type of judgement errors the company has made. Others, such as the company's 18 per cent investment in the Nine Mile Point 2 Nuclear Power Plant in Oswego County and the company's

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

May 7, 1982

investment of \$78 million in Bokum Resources Company, a mining venture that has resulted in flooded mineshafts and not an ounce of uranium, are but two more examples. There are many others. How can we trust LILCO's management with our safety? How can we let these people run a nuclear power plant in our own backyards? Because of these concerns, I am a co-sponsor of proposed legislation that would cause the takeover of Shoreham by the New York State Power Authority, which has a successful record of plant operation. Failing this, adequate independent supervision 24 hours a day, year round, must be stipulated in the licensing agreement -- if matters should come to that.

I also seriously question the need for a nuclear power plant at Shoreham. Since construction began in 1968, the costs of the plant have skyrocketed, from an estimate of \$261 million in 1973 to a probable price tag of over \$2.5 billion when completed in 1983. Perhaps given the conditions existing in 1968, Shoreham was seen as necessary. The times have changed. The future price of nuclear fuel is no easier to predict than the cost of oil is today. Will Shoreham be necessary for the needs of the population of Long Island in the future? Will electric usage rise or remain stable? These questions need to be addressed in detail before any license is granted.

Is Shoreham the most efficient method of supplying power to Long Island?

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

May 7, 1982

According to Freilicher, power is routinely purchased from upstate and other generating sources for less than the cost of producing electricity at Shoreham or any other LILCO facility. Should LILCO be producing power at all, if cheaper power is available for purchase?

Consideration should also be given to the cost of Shoreham, overruns and all; and its effects on the ratepayer of Long Island. Should the ratepayer be charged for the inability of LILCO's management to manage? To bring the construction of Shoreham in on time and in budget? The 1,000 percent increase in Shoreham's projected costs will mean an estimated 40 to 50 percent increase in consumer's electric bills with increased costs predicted to continue for the foreseeable future. By the company's own admission, the user will not benefit from Shoreham, unless there is an unforeseen catastrophe or international incident that sends the price of oil through the roof. Otherwise, it will be years before the ratepayer sees a cost savings attributable to Shoreham.

As Chairman of the Assembly Task Force on Utility Rates, I have proposed a ten-year phase-in of the costs of Shoreham into the rate base, in order to protect the people of Long Island. I urge implementation of this plan.

Respectfully submitted by
Assemblyman John L. Behan