

875

June 15, 1987

DOCKETED  
CONRAD  
DOCKET NUMBER  
PROPOSED RULE  
PR 50  
(53 FR 16435)

Dear Sirs - '88 JUN 23 12:16

How the Nuclear Regulatory Commission arrived at the decision to offer yet another proposed rule change for emergency planning baffles me.

The May 9th proposed rule will not hurt the Commission's credibility within the ten mile zone. People paying attention to Seabrook's licensing lost confidence in the process long ago -

but with this cannonade, and with the regional and to some extent, the national mainstream press no longer able to ignore the obvious, the general public knows something is wrong at the NRC. They know it, they talk about it - they understand what regulators, utility officials and federal regulators do not.

If you bend the rules enough they break.

The de facto deregulation of the Nuclear Industry cannot work. It is dishonest and it is imprudent.

Public confidence is lacking. The general perception of a Federal Agency guided more by the concerns of utilities and their investors, than by the law requiring protection of public health and safety, may bring enough people to ask what the Atomic Energy Act meant by National Security + Common Defense.

A lot of mistakes were made at Seabrook: by owners and by agencies in local, state and federal government; and also by the opposition who often made a better case for building Seabrook than did its proponents.

But now the NRC would return the favor, abandoning even the facade of impartiality. The commission's role is not to license a nuclear facility, but to assure that all rules, regulations and requirements are met, and that public safety can be assured. To suggest changing rules when the applicant has failed to comply with them is nothing new. What is new, and what makes this so hard to understand, is the blatant collusion between industry and government.

This time it is men and women on the street who are asking the questions. And to look beyond Seabrook, which may be far from their own towns to the plants on the South Shore, in Western Massachusetts and in Vermont. What might the NRC be doing at these facilities? What does the latest amendment imply for example, at Vermont Yankee?

I urge the NRC to reject the rule change of May 9th - to uphold the stay on low-power testing and to await the conclusion of emergency planning proceedings and the resolution of the ongoing financial debacle before permitting the fissioning of nuclear fuel at Seabrook.

Sincerely,   
DS-10

New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution, Inc.  
P.O. Box 545  
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
DOCKETING & SERVICE SECTION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
OF THE COMMISSION

Document ID: 6/20  
Project Ref: 1  
Title: ...  
Special Dist: ...  
Kagan  
JAMGOCHIAN  
RDS, PDR