

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50  
(52 FR 6980)

653

DOCKETED  
USNRC

'87 MAR 31 P5:03

March 5, 1987

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Lando Zech, Chairman  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1717 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Commissioner:

I am writing to express my concern over allowing power companies to determine state policy regarding the health and safety of the public.

I am strongly opposed to the NRC accepting evacuation plans submitted by a utility company.

Evacuation plans and procedures must be determined by the state legislature, for it is the state which is responsible for implementing these plans in an emergency. We entrust our elected officials with the responsibility to make decisions regarding public safety. For the NRC to put public safety into the hands of a private utility company is irresponsible.

I urge you to leave decisions regarding public health and safety in the hands of those who we have elected to make those decisions.

Sincerely,

*Kathleen E Mac Neil*

K MacNeil  
18 Mellen St. Apt #2  
Dorchester, MA. 02124

8704060179 370331  
PDR PR  
50 52FR6980 PDR

DSIO  
add: P Crane, H-1035  
1/0

Acknowledged by card APR 1 1987

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

(52 FR 6980)

(655)

DOCKETED  
USNRC

'87 MAR 31 P4:57

57 Hollywood St.  
Worcester, MA 01610  
March 27, 1987

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH


Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1717 H St.  
Washington, DC

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to request that you uphold the current 10-mile evacuation planning zone for nuclear power plants and the regulations giving state and local governments the authority to approve or deny these plans. To undermine this process would make a mockery of a system which was designed to protect the health and lives of citizens who live near nuclear installations.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,



Ted D. Conna  
Regional Environmental Council  
Worcester, Mass.

APR 1 1987

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROPOSED RULE PR-52 (658)  
(52 FR 6980)

DOCKETED  
USNRC

'87 MAR 31 P5:15

1091 Madison Ave.  
Livermore, Ca. 94550  
March 28, 1987

Mr. Samuel Chilk, Secretary  
U.S. NRC  
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Dear Mr. Chilk,

I am writing concerning the proposed rule change of Marbh 6 on licensing of nuclear power plants. Where the States are simply throwing up road blocks, the Commission should be allowed to license the plant forthwith.

I attended the recent Waste Management Conference in Tucson. There was enough nonsense about issues to make a grown man cry. I couldn't believe some of the nonsense coming from my home state of Washington. Further, the progress being made by the French and British should serve as an embarrassment to the authorities in the United States! We who developed nuclear energy are now watching the rest of the world reap the benefits.

So, anything to speed up the licensing process should be pushed.

Sincerely yours,

*E. Wesley Murbach*  
E. Wesley Murbach

Excuse the lousy typing, it isn't easy to learn at age 64.

Acknowledged by gov. APR 1 1987





North Fork  
Opponents of  
Nuclear  
Exposure



MAR 31 P5:05

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

5-27-87

Secretary  
United States Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, DC 20555  
Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

To: The Nuclear Regulatory Commissioners

Re: Proposed Rule Change concerning Evacuation

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed rule change concerning local and state participation in nuclear plant evacuation plans. Emergency response plans must include State and local authorities. These are the only people who know whether the area can be adequately evacuated.

It is totally unacceptable to allow a nuclear facility to be licensed without the development and testing of an evacuation plan that includes state and local participation. This proposed rule usurps local police powers and threatens the health and safety of millions of Americans.

The NRC staff paper acknowledges that no new scientific data is available to support this change from the original law, which was enacted in 1980 following the accident at the Three Mile Island facility. Is the NRC looking for a way to change the rule in order to license plants in areas where there is public opposition? The NRC is charged with protecting the public's health and welfare, not the financial investment of the utilities. THIS RULE CHANGE MUST BE REJECTED!

The North Fork Opponents to Nuclear Exposure, an organization with several thousand supporters, is concerned about the affect of this rule change on the licensing of the Shoreham Nuclear Plant. On Long Island State and local authorities believe that they cannot protect the public in the event of an accident at Shoreham. The utility, Long Island Lighting Company, has a plan that is a sham and does not take into account many of the real situations which occur surrounding the Plant. There is no way to evacuate the area around Shoreham and this has been documented over and over by local residents.

It is time the NRC became responsible to the people it is supposed to protect: the citizens of this country. Do not allow this rule change. It is unjust! Sincerely,

*Philip R. Marriner*

PHILIP R. MARRINER  
BOX 449  
SAILORS NEEDLE RD.  
MATTITUCK, N.Y. 11952

N.O.N.E Box 659 New Suffolk, N.Y. 11956 734-6258

POSTED MAR 27 1987  
-58  
(52 FR 6980) 662

# CENTEREACH CIVIC ASSOCIATION

POST OFFICE BOX 35  
CENTEREACH, NEW YORK 11720

DOCKETED  
USNRC

87 MAR 31 A10:21

March 27, 1987  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20055

Attention: Docketing and Service Branch


Dear Secretary:

The Centereach Civic Association membership has voted and is strongly opposed to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposed rule change regarding Offsite Emergency Evacuation Procedures. [10 CFR ].

We feel the State and Local authorities are the best authorities to conduct and evaluate these evacuation procedures.

As the Civic Association of Brookhaven Town's largest community we are opposed to this attempt by the N.R.C. to override the concerns of our State and Local officials in regard to nuclear plants like Shoreham.

Sincerely,



Anthony Tascarella, President  
Centereach Civic Association

AT

cc: Senator Daniel Moynihan  
Senator Alfonse D'Amato  
Congressman George Hochbrucker  
Members - Suffolk County Legislature

APR 1 1987  
Acknowledged by card.....

March 30, 1987

-50

(665)

(52 FR 6980)

87 MAR 31 P5:15

Secretary of the Commission  
Nuclear Regulatory Comm.  
Washington D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Attention: Docketing and Services Branch

Regarding the proposed amendment to  
part 50 of the N.R.C. regulations --

Get real - We are seated in here on  
Eastern Long Island and we are painfully  
aware of the fact that when the Shoreham  
Nuclear Plant melts, we will be geographically  
trapped. Having first hand information from  
sources who worked on this installation, the  
chances of disaster are in the making and  
if this plant should ever be permitted to open,  
the citizens of Eastern L.I. will be walking  
corpses.

Wishful thinking that evacuation is  
possible as <sup>being</sup> shamefully projected by those who  
will not be suffering this trap.

Respectfully,

Mary J. Brady

3500 Purcell Rd. 13 - Mattituck, NY. 11952

APR 1 1987

Notwithstanding any notice...



DOCKETED  
USNRC

'87 MAR 31 P6:27

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH2 Island Road  
Sound Beach N.Y. 11789  
March 26, 1987

Secretary of N.R.C.  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Sir:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's decision to include a rule to by-pass state and local government is not only a contradiction of its own rules but a flagrant denial of individual rights to life, safety etc. provided for in the U.S. Constitution.

Signed

Evelyn Rubano

(Mrs. George)

DOCKET  
USNRC

'87 MAR 31 P6:29

Box 247

Wellfleet, Ma. 02667

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

March 29, 1987

Dear Mr. Chilk,

I understand that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has proposed permitting nuclear power plants to operate without local or state government participation in emergency planning. This seems incredible to me. It is like a hotel deciding to do without the town or city's fire department and planning to use their own fire extinguishers and buckets of water. If it were just a question of a building burning to the ground, one might think that if they were foolish enough to think they could put out a fire without the help of the fire department it was their own fault if the hotel burned to the ground. Unfortunately, the hotel is full of people and the fire might and probably would spread to other buildings.

Please vote against this preposterous NRC rule change.

Sincerely,

*Elizabeth H Robbins*



87 MAR 31 P 6:25

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

To Commission chairman  
Lando Zech.

Dear Sir

I live in Salisbury, Mass. about five miles from the Seabrook Nuclear plant, and the thought of that plant opening is terrifying.

Our home is on Route 1A, Beach Rd, and in the summer time, with the tourist traffic, we have a real problem getting out of our driveway and onto the highway. If there was a problem at the Seabrook plant, we would be trapped, as would be everyone else on Beach Rd. There is no other way off Beach Rd.

It also frightens me that towns near a nuclear plant seem to have such a high rate of cancer.

For the safety of thousands of people, please do not allow Seabrook to open. Carolyn Sargent  
Salisbury, Mass.

DOCKET NUMBER  
REPORTED FILE

(52 FR 6980)

-52 (656)

DOCKETED  
USNRC

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1717 H Street  
Washington, D. C., 20555

'87 MAR 31 P4:56

Dear Commissioners:

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

The Governors, Senators and Congressmen representing more than 35 million people testified before the NRC on February 24, 1987 on the proposed rule change to license nuclear power plants where state and local governments refuse to cooperate in evacuation planning.

More than 75% of the people of Long Island have spoken out against Shoreham as determined by the last two polls conducted by Newsday.

You Sirs, and your staff members, should be held criminally liable for injuries and deaths sustained as a result of your decision to usurp the functions of state and local government to protect the health and safety of citizens under the 10th Amendment of the Constitution.

In this 60 day period of public comment, we the people of Long Island wish it recorded, that we earnestly protest the licensing of Shoreham on the grounds that feasibility studies done by impartial evaluators have shown that there is no safe way to evacuate the citizens of Long Island in the event of a nuclear accident. We, therefore, also vehemently protest the actions of the NRC to put the self-serving interests of Lilco before our health and safety.

Sincerely,

*John K. ...*

LONG ISLAND COALITION  
FOR SAFE LIVING  
Box 1355  
Massapequa, N. Y. 11758

Acknowledged by card... APR 1 1987