

PR 55 52FR6780

PROPOSED RULE PR-APR
(150)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington D.C. 20555



MAR - 6 1987

March 3rd, 1987

(150)

Dear Mr. Chilk,

I am vehemently opposed to a decrease in the size of the emergency planning zone (EPZ) of any nuclear power plant and I am shocked that Seabrook is up for a nine mile decrease in its EPZ from ten miles to one mile. I oppose all site specific EPZs and request there be no waiver for Seabrook.

I feel that:

1.) a ten mile zone is too small and the minimum should be a twenty to twenty-five mile zone, with expansion possibilities but no zone decreases allowed.

2.) rules should not be changed because a private energy company (Seabrook) runs into legal snags. The NRC has moral and legal obligations to work for public safety interests.

3.) if passed, the proposed rule change would set a precedent and zones around other nuclear power plants could also be decreased.

4.) the probability of a serious accident at a nuclear power plant is dependent on many factors, human error included and even if the nuclear industry's assessment of low accident probability is accepted, the "safety" measure of a ten mile evacuation zone is already a token measure when one contemplates any serious nuclear accident. (Chernobyl springs to mind.) The idea is to try to minimize the horrendous physical and genetic consequences of a nuclear mishap. Anyway, in 1985 the NRC rated the chance of a core melt-down accident by the year 2000 at 45%.

5.) Seabrook's problem is political and this rule changing attempt is a direct response to a state's refusal to approve an unacceptable evacuation plan. State's rights are at stake here. And which is more important, the economic welfare of the nuclear industry or the health and safety of the American population?

8807200091 870303
PDR PR
50 52FR6980 PDR

17510

Therefore let it be known that I am opposed to petition 50-45 and to site specific SFZs, and feel that ten mile SFZs are inadequate for all nuclear power plants in the U.S. I offer my support for PSM 50-46 which would expand existing SFZs and the fifty mile ingestion pathway, and also increases state's rights regarding emergency plans.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth Lauer