

E.P. Gauthier  
10 Dwight Road  
Raymond, N.H.

(904)

DOCKETED  
USNRC

22 June 1988

Secretary of the Commission  
Attn: Docketin 788 am JUN 23 1988 P4 152 inch  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555  
OFFICE OF INSPECTION  
Dear Sirs, DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

DOCKET NUMBER PR  
PROPOSED RULE (S3FR16435) 50

Being a resident of New Hampshire as well as a visitor to Seabrook Station, it has become obvious to me that a lot of confusion and misunderstanding exists in the public's mind about what is required for 5% "low power" testing vs. 100% "full power" operation. It is because of this that I fully support the proposed "Interpretive Rule" to clarify your intent on the requirements for testing vs. operation. And it is certainly about time the NRC regulates the nuclear industry instead of the politicians regulating the NRC.

I encourage you, therefore, with regards to the proposed "Interpretive Rule," to include means whereby the public and local and state government officials in N.H. and Mass. will be far better informed about in-place safety systems being designed to handle 100% full power operation emergencies, available time for emergency action at 5% low power testing being much longer, 5% low power being for the purpose of testing, and the risk factors at low power testing being significantly lower than at 100% full power operation.

These items along with Seabrook Station's double-walled containment, a fully operational N.H. siren notification system, and the Emergency Broadcast System should help to indicate that emergency preparedness requirements for low power testing vs. full power operation do not in any way decrease public safety.

Sincerely yours,

*E.P. Gauthier*

BB07010170 BB0622  
PDR PR  
50 53FR16435 PDR

DS-10