

BOX 621

PROPOSED RULE **PR 50**

May 27-88

POCONSBURG 17815

(53 FR 16435)

Re: Proposed rule - Emergency Planning for ~~Low~~ Power Operations (at Seabrook) ~~USNRC~~

E Nemethy, Sec'y

Fed Reg - May 9-88, p 16435

Sec'y - NRC

'88 JUN -1 8:57

ATT: DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Gentlemen -

As of May 23, we still had not rec'd a copy of the above proposed rule from NRC. However, Nuclear Information & Resources Service (NIRS) provided a copy.

A number of years ago, the AEC or NRC committed a prize boo-boo by awarding a construction license for Seabrook.

(It really doesn't matter whether it was AEC or NRC - both are the same old crowd, but with different initials)

The area around Seabrook - as has been pointed out with considerable vehemence and repeated protests - would be impossible to evacuate in case of a "low likelihood" major accident.

Oct 29-87, NRC approved a rule change to allow "consideration" of granting operating licenses to both Seabrook and Shoreham. NRC added this was no guarantee the plants would be licensed.

Come off it, please! Who're you trying to kid?

According to NIRS, this current proposed rule was presented to you Apr 20-88 by a Mr Victor Stello Jr, Exec Dir for Operations.

The name rang a bell. Isn't this the same gentleman who intervened some time back to squelch an upcoming investigation of conditions <sup>at</sup> ~~are~~ TVA's Watts Bar reactors?

Now you want to grant a low power license to Seabrook, on grounds that at low power, risks to public health and safety are "significantly lower than at full power."

But - aren't you forgetting something?

At full power, any kind of evacuation plan would mean zilch.

If you railroad this proposed rule thru - and we assume you will - we have one question:

What do you plan for an encore?

8806140405 880527  
PDR PR  
50 53FR16435 PDR