

BUCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-322-063

BUCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-D PR-50

FEB 23 1987

(52 FR 6980)

(63)

The Southampton Press

135 WINDMILL LANE, SOUTHAMPTON, LONG ISLAND, NEW YORK 11968 87-283-1100-2 P5:41

PETER B. BOODY / Editor

February 25, 1987

Lando W. Zech, Jr., Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Zech:

I am enclosing a copy of the Southampton Press editorial about the NRC's proposed rule change for your information. My hope is that it's good enough to help change some minds.

Sincerely,

Peter B. Boody
Peter B. Boody

ldp/enc.

8807200084 870225
PDR PR
50 52FR6980 PDR

DS10

their reasons for voting as they did. They deferred all questions to the school administrator, who is supposed to be the School Board's employee.

The public has a real problem on its hands when its elected officials cannot or will not defend or even discuss important policy decisions in a public forum.

Public Be Damned

The Shoreham crisis has gotten the Nuclear Regulatory Commission so balled up trying both to play by the rules and shepherd Shoreham into operation at the same time that it has finally thrown in the towel. To hell with the rules, to hell with all Shoreham's opponents, to hell with the lessons of Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, to hell with state and local government and the people of Suffolk County. We've got a national nuclear energy policy to protect here. Get that damned plant on line.

Ever since the Three Mile Island near-meltdown, the NRC has played by the rule that a locally approved evacuation plan must be in place before it will license a plant. The rule seemed like a good idea because no one knew what they were doing in the first hours and even days of the Three Mile Island accident in 1979. After all, no one really had ever believed there might be an accident at Three Mile Island or at any American nuclear plant ... why bother with a locally approved evacuation plan?

Thank Providence that the Three Mile Island accident wasn't any worse ... say, as bad as the Chernobyl mess.

New York State and Suffolk County have ruled after careful research that evacuation of the population near the Shoreham plant would be utterly impossible in case of an accident. There are too many people, too few roads (all heading toward a bottleneck) and water all around. They will not approve an evacuation plan and say Shoreham should never be allowed to open.

What happens? The NRC announces it's had enough of this ridiculous "locally approved evacuation plan" rule ... local and state governments are holding national nuclear energy policy hostage. So forget the rule; no locally approved evacuation plan is needed anymore.

Government is supposed to be for the people, not against them. The NRC, in trampling on its own reasonable rules, would argue that it's trying to serve all of the American people because they need a national nuclear energy policy to keep their country strong. But the NRC is not supposed to be an administrative arm of the White House, Congress or any department of government with the policy goal of promoting nuclear power. It's supposed to be an independent commission that reviews nuclear projects on a case by case basis with an eye to providing for and protecting the public welfare. The country needs a commission with that responsibility because nuclear power is so potentially dangerous.

But something has gone very wrong. The NRC is a strident promoter of national nuclear policy and it is willing to sacrifice the safety of millions of people to see that policy executed.

THE SOUTHAMPTON PRESS / FEBRUARY 12, 1987

Suffolk Clo

By Karl Grossman

In the wake of the new national holiday commemorating Martin Luther King's birthday, Suffolk County still has far — far — to go to be a place where racism and other forms of discrimination have ended.

Just two days after the recent King memorial, two black men were attacked in Deer Park by a group of whites who brandished sticks.

The two black men, brothers, were several times before they were barely able to return to their car and escape. The car was battered — windows broken and made in the metal — by the five white men.

The two blacks had tried to assist a woman working in a cashier's booth in a station at whom two of the whites had been yelling racial epithets. Then the group of whites turned on the two men.

Charles Randall of Riverhead, president of the Eastern Long Island National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, describes the racial situation here as showing "very little improvement."

People say there's not as much discrimination, but I can't see any steps forward on the East End or in Suffolk County for that matter. We're still fighting the same battles — no representation in government, housing and employment discrimination — right down the line.

Mr. Randall is supervisor of the Suffolk County Migrant Health Program and is taking that tries to service the more than 1,000 migrant farm laborers who work in Suffolk — largely black and still earning what has repeatedly and accurately been called "Twentieth Century slavery." He has become locked into the system, trying (and most never succeeding) with their own earnings to pay off debts they owe their crew chiefs for what passes for medical shelter.

There are no blacks elected to any government office in Suffolk on the federal or state levels. No black is in a position to elect the county at large. There is one black judge, a judge of the District Court, who covers western Suffolk. Despite his long and distinguished record of Judgequette Floyd, and his strong election, he inexplicably remains on that lower bench.

The Southampton Press

Incorporating The Bridgehampton News

Established 1897

Published Weekly on Thursday by the Southampton Press Publishing Company, Inc.
135 Windmill Lane, Southampton, Long Island, New York

Telephone: (516) 283-4100
Mail Address: Box 1207
Southampton, N.Y. 11968



Second Class Postage
paid at Southampton, N.Y.
Pub. No. 504360

Publisher
Donald H. Louchheim

Editor
Peter L. Boody

Associate Editor
Mary Cummings

Senior Correspondent
Douglas P. Love

Special Correspondent
Karl Grossman

Advertising
Carolyn Sherwin
(Coordinator)
John Wyche
Carol Mantell
Albert Berman

Operations Manager
Michael Strycharuk

Production Manager
Rory McHugh

Editor

Perplexing Policy

It may have been legal, but it was a move of questionable propriety when the Bridgehampton School Board voted last fall to raise \$205,000 more through a taxation than voters had approved in June ... or \$292,000 more than the amount they had rejected in May, when the School Board's original 1986-87 school budget was turned down.

News of the step, which failed because the Board of Cooperative Educational Services didn't do Bridgehampton's revised tax paperwork in time, surfaced only last week. The vote went unreported when it took place in September, missed by the public and by reporters — perhaps because it was isolated from the rest of the board's resolutions on the evening's agenda, and put off until the end of the board's meeting.

When taxpayers vote on a school district budget, they are approving or disapproving the amount to be spent on running the system — not how much will be raised through taxation to support the budget. All that is in flux when budgets are drafted because tax assessments for the year aren't complete. So technically speaking, the School Board did not "thwart the will of the voters" when it took news of an unexpectedly high final assessment figure as an opportunity to boost income without