

BUCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC.

50-443/444-0L

BUCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-DPR-50

27

(FEB 23 1987)

CS2 FR 6908

10 Beach Road
Salisbury, MA 01952
Feb. 17, 1987

Nuclear Regulatory Commission '87 FEB 27 P4:30
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Chairman Lando Zech, and ^{OFFICERS} Members James Asseltine, Thomas Roberts,
Frederick Bernthal, Kenneth Carr

Please do not issue a low power license, or reduce the emergency planning zone for Seabrook. The Seabrook plant has had many problems during construction--cracks, with personnel, etc., and there could well be more! A recent valve problem and delayed notification to outside officials confirms our previous concerns as to how the plant officials might react in a greater emergency. This plant was built in a cramped, highly-populated area, on a shale foundation and earthquake chain, which never should have been done in the first place. No nuclear plant is guaranteed safe. In spite of modern science and the plant owners referring to it as "the safest nuclear plant in the country", accidents still happen anytime, anywhere. The only safe plan is to shut Seabrook down completely for good. In regard to the emergency planning zone, a much larger area is needed than now planned in order to protect those closest to the reactor, due to spontaneous evacuation of those farther away who would be blocking the roads. People 50 miles away have had to be evacuated because of radioactive hotspots and food 1200 miles away from accidents has been contaminated. If we were able to get out (which is impossible), due to limited ways of escape combined with human error, and panic-- absolute chaos!, we never could return--everything we worked all our lives for would be contaminated and ruined, and no insurance covers this.

I write with deep concern, not only for my own household, but for the entire mass of people living in this crowded area. There is no possible way to evacuate the people in this whole congested area surrounding Seabrook. The plant poses as a nightmare on our once peaceful seacoast towns. Must the people now live in constant fear? The people do not want it. We do not need Seabrook. The cost would place an impossible burden on the poor, disabled, and the elderly. We protest its waste contamination and the threat healthwise of nuclear exposure from the plant. The plant is only good for a few years, then what? Let's quit while we are still ahead and use a safer, healthier and more economical way of generating electricity, which is fast becoming the trend in many places. In these modern days of progress, let us not be outmoded!

We ask each one of you, "Would you enjoy a peaceful night's sleep, enjoy your daily life, or feel secure about your children, if confined so close to this "monster"?"

The States, local governments, and its people should pass judgment on this because it directly involves them all and is the American way of handling things.

After considering all the hazards involved in this area, we trust you will oppose the licensing of the Seabrook plant for all time.

Sincerely yours,

Ann L. Fowle
Ann L. Fowle

DS10

8807180305 370217
PDR PR
50 52FR6980 PDR