

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

2221

(52 FR 6980)

DOCKETED
IN NRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A8:42

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Dietrich
(Name)

2 David Rd.
(Address)

N. Massapequa, NY 11758
(Town, State, Zip)

8705050044 870428
PDR PR
50 52FR6980 PDR

DS10
add: P. Crane, H-1035
of line, 266 Ph-L

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50
(52 FR 6980)

2222

DOCKETED
USNRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A8:38

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Peter Stungato

(Name)

815 Gundy Ave.

(Address)

Holbrook, NY 11741

(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER
~~PROPOSED RULE~~ PR-50)
(52 FR 6980)

2228
DOCKETED
USNRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A9:28

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Miss Meta Hein
(Name)

10 Muncy Ave #107
(Address)

West Babylon N.Y. 11704
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOC# NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

2229

April, 1987

(52 FR 6980)

'87 APR 28 A9:39

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Mr. T. Merriweather
(Name)

20 Seneca St
(Address)

N. Babylon, NY 11703
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCK
PROPOSED RULE PR-52 2232
(52 FR 6980)
DOCKETED
USNRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 P12:12

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Roberta Kenney
(Name)

65 Chestnut St.
(Address)

Brentwood, N.J. 07117
(Town, State, Zip)

Acknowledged by card..... MAY 04 1987

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

2233

DOCKETED
USNRC

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50
(52 FR 6980)

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 P12:12

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:


I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,


(Name)

Mr & Mrs Lawrence Jacob Mr & Mrs Lawrence Jacob
836 SOUTH SIXTH STREET 836 SOUTH SIXTH STREET
LINDENHURST, NY 11757 LINDENHURST, NY 11757
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-58

2235

April, 1987

(52 FR 6980)

'87 APR 28 A8:54

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Bill Grosso

(Name)

41 Grissom Way

(Address)

Waukegan, NY 11788

(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

April, 1987

JACKET NUMBER
~~PROPOSED RULE~~ PR-50 (1296)
(52 FR 6980) DOCKETED
BUS NRC

'87 APR 28 A10:29

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Joseph G. Carneiro
(Name)

75 MOODY AVE
(Address)

FSUP, N.Y. 1175
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987
Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER
~~PROPOSED RULE~~ **PR-50**
(52 FR 6980)

2237

DOCKETED
USNRC

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

'87 APR 28 A8:54

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operation license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Deborah J. Variana
(name)

4 Springtime Lane
(address)

Levittown, NY 11756
(town, state, zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50
(52 FR 6980)

2238

DOCKETED
USNRC

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

'87 APR 28 A8:59

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operation license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Albert F. Craig
(name)

178 Red Maple Drive
(address)

Levittown, N.Y. 11756
(town, state, zip)

MAY 04 1987

acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

2239

(52 FR 6980)

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 APR 28 A8:54

April, 1987

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Kyrle J. Anderson
48 Bayshore Rd.
West Islip, NY 11795

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

2240

DOCKETED
IN NRC

(52 FR 6980)

'87 APR 28 A9:58

To: Secretary, Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Re: Low-power testing at Seabrook and 10 CFR Part 50

Date: 4/87

Please register my ^{very} strong objection both to low-power testing at the Seabrook nuclear power plant and to the proposed rule to allow the NRC to issue operating licenses to utilities even in situations where state governors consider emergency evacuation plans inadequate to ensure the safety of the public.

State governors can contribute an important and impartial voice to decisions on evacuation planning. At the Seabrook plant, over 100,000 people gather at nearby beaches on hot summer days, and no one has yet produced a reasonable plan to evacuate them in the event of a major release of radiation. Governor Dukakis should be applauded for refusing to approve unworkable evacuation plans. In doing so he has insisted that the safety of area residents and visitors be placed ahead of the financial interests of the utility involved. A company with a large investment in a power plant cannot be counted on to make such a wise decision, which is why evacuation planning should never rest with the utilities themselves.

On the issue of low-power testing, if the NRC licenses New Hampshire Yankee before the emergency planning debate is resolved, you will send the public the clearest possible message that the Commission is committed to seeing Seabrook go on line at any cost. This is not an appropriate position for a regulatory agency to take.

Thank you for considering and recording my opinion on these issues.

Sincerely,

Donna Callegos-Petersen
John A. Petersen

Gallegos/Petersen
3 Allston St.
Amesbury, MA 01913-1601

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

(52 FR 6980)

PR-50

2241

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 APR 28 A8:43

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Docketing and Service Branch
Secretary of the Commission
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Sir:

I am opposed to your proposed rule change which would allow public utilities to submit evacuation plans for communities within the EPZ's of nuclear power plants, when state and local governments refuse to participate in such planning. This proposed rule contradicts President Reagan's position that "this administration does not favor the imposition of federal authority over the objections of state and local governments in matters regarding the adequacy of an emergency evacuation plan for a nuclear power plant." Has the President forgotten this position or does the present NRC board repudiate the Presidents' views? The Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, states clearly that any plans developed without state participation cannot meet their safety standards. Would the commission dismantle FEMA as well? Since Chernobyl, three countries have abandoned nuclear power altogether: Austria, Sweden, and the Philippines, with Greece canceling its first reactor. According to Worldwatch Institute polls, 78% of all Americans oppose any further nuclear power plants. The NRC prefers to dig in its heels and license nuclear power plants at any cost to public health and safety. Perhaps it is time for the resignations of chairman Lando Zech and Mr. Victor Stello for starters. The people will turn to Congress to have their voice heard. I believe we still have a democratic form of government in this country.

Yours truly,

Amy Fischer
Camden, ME

P.O. BOX 540
Camden, ME

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

April, 1987

2244
DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50
DOCKETED USNRC
(52 FR 6980)

'87 APR 28 P5:19

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Mackelaine McCormack
(Name)

99 Prospect Street 1B
(Address)

Babylon, N.Y. 11702
(Town, State, Zip)

MAK 1 1987
Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

JACKET NUMBER PR-58 2247
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980)
JACKETED
USNRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A9:40

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Dorothy Ostrowski
(Name)
221 Newberry St.
(Address)
Brentwood, N.Y. 11717
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Send this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50 (2248)
(52 FR 6980)

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A9:40

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Mr. J. Hadden J. Ostrawski
(Name)

221 Newberry St.
(Address)

Brentwood, New York
(Town, State, Zip)

11717

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card

Send this line, and return to me before April 24.

HAROLD GUBBINS
16 COVENTREY LN.
CENTRAL ISLIP, NY
11722



CKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE **PR-50**
(52 FR 6980)

April, 1987



DOCKETER
USNRC



'87 APR 28 P2:49

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Harold E. Gubbins
(Name)

60 Coventry Lane
(Address)

Central Islip N.Y. 11722
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50. 2253
(52 FR 6980) DOCKETED
USNRC

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

'87 APR 28 P3:51

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Commissioners:

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,

Dorothy M. Disken

*Disken
P.O. Box 931
Montauk, N.Y. 11954*

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50
(52 FR 6980)

2256
DOCKETED
USNRC

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

'87 APR 28 P3:53

Dear Commissioners:

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
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,

William F. Siskin

P.O. Box 931

Montauk, N.Y. 11954

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

EAST END SHOREHAM OPPONENTS
Post Office Drawer XXXX
East Hampton, NY 11937



RICHARD E. PETTICREW,
Chairman

County of Monroe, Michigan
Board of Commissioners

125 EAST SECOND STREET, MONROE, MICHIGAN 48161
Telephone: (313) 243-7016

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

(52 FR 6980)

DOCKETED
DATE

'87 APR 28 P3:34

OFFICE OF CLERK
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

April 22, 1987

Mr. Landow Zech, Chairman
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Chairman Zech:

At a Regular Meeting of the Monroe County Board of Commissioners held on April 14, 1987, the Board went on record in opposition to the NRC proposed rule, which would allow the licensing of nuclear power plants without state or local emergency plan approval.

Sincerely,

Richard E. Petticrew, Chairman
Monroe County Board of Commissioners

REP/jp

cc: John D. Dingell

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card

JACKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-58
(52 FR 6980) 2265
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

15 Old Lowell Rd
Westford MA 01886
April 23, 1987

'87 APR 28 P5:21

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555

Dear Sir:

We strongly object to the proposal to change the rule regarding state-approved evacuation plans for commercial nuclear power plants--10 CFR part 50. Under the proposed change, new nuclear plants could be licenced without workable or state-approved evacuation plans.

This proposed change makes a mockery of the states' prime responsibility--to protect the lives and health of their citizens. The new rule would allow as acceptable paper plans submitted solely by utility companies. Such plans are inevitably self-interested, however sincere the corporate officials who devise those plans. This would undermine a key aspect of our democratic freedom.

The tragedy at Chernobyl makes it all the more urgent that there be proper evacuation plans in the event of a nuclear accident. More stringent safety rules were introduced by you after the Three Mile Island accident. That was quite correct, but Chernobyl shows that yet more strict rules are needed, NOT more lax ones.

We live about 40 miles from the Seabrook plant, whose start-up you are currently considering. So we are particularly at risk if you approve undemocratic and unworkable evacuation planning procedures. BUT we have many friends who live further away than we do from commercial nuclear plants, who share our deep concern about evacuation planning. So we KNOW we are not merely writing you out of narrow self-interest.

Above all, please put human lives above corporate profit. We would ourselves be glad to pay extra on our taxes or electricity bills, if in fact that is what is necessary to make nuclear power plants and their evacuation fully safe.

Sincerely yours,

Marilyn MacDougall

Marilyn MacDougall

John MacDougall

John MacDougall

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

(52 PR 6980)

PR-50

2269

April 18, 1987

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 APR 28 P3:35

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

To Nuclear Regulatory Commissioners,

As a resident of *Harvard*, located *70* miles from the proposed Seabrook Nuclear Power plant, I oppose any rules change to limit the participation of states and localities in the emergency planning process.

Familiar with transportation systems and emergency response capabilities near a given plant, states and localities are in the best position to know whether evacuation plans adequately address foreseeable problems in an emergency situation and whether measures to protect the public are at all possible given a radiological emergency.

By limiting the roles of states and localities in emergency planning, public health and safety is relegated to a position of secondary importance - as it had been prior to the lessons learned from the tragic Three Mile Island accident.

The Commission has recently argued, "Significant policy questions of equity and fairness are presented where a utility has substantially completed construction and committed substantial resources to a nuclear power plant and then, after it is far too late realistically for the utility to reverse course, the State or local government opposes the plant by non-cooperation in offsite emergency planning."

The adverse economic consequences to which the Commission alludes, cannot provide valid basis for relaxing safety regulations. A "best efforts" standard just will not work. The health and safety of this country's residents must take precedence over the interests of business and investors. As a commission charged to oversee the safety of nuclear power plants in the United States, it is incumbent upon you to make certain that our health is not compromised.

Best regards,

Claude M. Madden
178 E. Bare Hill Rd.
Harvard, Ma.

MAY 04 1987

01451

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKETED
USNRC

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE

PR-58

(52 FR 6980)

2275

'87 APR 28 A9:34

RFD 2, Box 291
Waldoboro ME 04572

April 22, 1987

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555

Att: Docketing and Service Branch (10 CFR Part 50)

Dear Sirs:

I strongly urge you to withdraw your proposed rule change, 10 CFR Part 50, allowing nuclear power plants to be licensed without a workable and state approved evacuation plan.

Last year's accident at Chernobyl should convince everyone that the dangers inherent in nuclear power plants demand strengthened regulations to protect people's lives and health.

From now until all nuclear plants are closed our citizens and the government should demand that the Regulatory Commission maintain and enforce all possible measures for protecting public safety.

Janet Sharp
Janet Sharp

cc: Representative Joseph Brennan
Senator George Mitchell
Senator William Cohen

*P.S. Radio news has just announced that you have
decided not to change the evacuation plan rules.
Thank you.*

ACKNOWLEDGED BY CARD.....
MAY 14 1987

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

(52 FR 6980)

PR-58

2279

'87 APR 28 A9:10

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH


Gregg McCutcheon
24 Fisher Avenue
Brockton, MA 02401
April 21, 1987

US. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
ATTN: Mr. Lando Zech

Dear Mr. Zech,

I am writing you as a concerned citizen and parent to express my strongest opposition to the NRC's vote to develop emergency plans without the cooperation of states involved. Such a policy would grossly violate the rights of families living in the long shadow cast by nuclear plants. I strongly urge you overturn this decision and promise to work diligently should you ignore the safety of citizens in our area.

Sincerely,



Gregg McCutcheon

ACKNOWLEDGED BY CA.

MAY 1 1987



Griffin
Valley Road
Mason, NH 03048
803-878-2282

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

(52 FR 6980)

2280
DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 APR 28 A9:11

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

April 24, 1987

Secretary
US NRC
Washington, DC 20555
Attn: Docketing and Service Branch
10 CFR Part 50

Dear Sir:

Your proposed rule change (10 CFR Part 50) is an outrage. You seem to be setting the financial interest of nuclear power proponents above your own responsibility for public safety. The proposed rule change interferes with the right of states to protect their citizens. The history of nuclear power plant construction and operation in this country (and elsewhere) hardly inspires one's confidence in the public utilities' commitment to protecting the public safety.

For Pete's sake, would YOU want to live (or spend your vacations) a mile away from Seabrook, or any other nuclear power plant? Of course not!

Your proposed rule change would seriously endanger the public safety. More--not less--stringent controls are needed.

Sincerely,

Edith Griffin
Edith Griffin

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

SAMUEL C. BROWN, Jr.

129 Caroline Street, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

DOCKET
PROPOSED RULE PR-50
(52 FR 6980)
APR 28 A9:14
2283

April 23, 1987

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Mr. Lando Zech
Chairman
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Zech:

This letter is written in response to your call for a 60-day period for public comment on your proposed rule change which would allow nuclear power plants to obtain operating licenses even when state and local officials refuse to cooperate in emergency planning.

I am opposed to this rule change.

We should have learned from Three Mile Island and Chernobyl that nuclear power plants are inherently far more dangerous than anyone had supposed. Emergency planning is vital. In its absence, for whatever reason, no plant should be licensed by your NRC. The matter should then proceed through the courts, or to the legislatures or the U.S. Congress.

Nuclear power is too dangerous an issue to be determined by any regulatory agency, including yours. It requires the full participatory political process. Lives may be at stake.

If people are to risk their lives and their futures for the sake of obtaining energy, the decisions must be made through democracy, not through bureaucracy.

Sincerely,

Samuel C. Brown, Jr.
Samuel C. Brown, Jr.

2293

DOCKET NUMBER PR-50
PROPOSED RULE (52 FR 6980)

1026 Ocean Blvd. DOCKETING
Hampton, N.H. SERVICE
Apr. 24, 1987 USNR

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.

'87 APR 28 AM 11:41

Dear Commissioners:

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

I am opposed to a rules change which could allow the management of Seabrook Nuclear Plant to submit its own emergency evacuation plan to your agency. We have no assurance the utility's plan on paper or in operation would adequately reflect the realities of the surrounding communities. It is appropriate and necessary for local governments to determine emergency responses in the event of an accident at Seabrook.

If the area around Seabrook cannot be evacuated, I feel the facility should not be granted any operating licenses.

Sincerely yours,

Margaret Chase
Margaret Chase

DOCKETED
JAN 10

2294
DOCKET NUMBER PR-52
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980)

April 22, 1987

'87 APR 28 A8:44

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

8 Marlboro Lane
East Islip, NY 11730

Secretary of the Commission
Nuclear Regulatory Comm
Washington, DC 20555

ATT: Docketing & Service Branch

RE: Proposed Amendment to
Part 50 of N.R.C. Reg's

Dear Secretary:

This action of your commission is a willful misuse of power and will not be tolerated.

Time and time again the people who live on Long Island have voiced in great majority, their opposition to the opening of Shoreham. We are not necessarily against Nuclear Power. However, it has been proven that the particular characteristics of Long Island would make the opening of such a plant here, not only fools folly but possibly disastrous!

Not long ago a truck overturned on the L.I.E. (one of the major arteries off the Island) traffic was stopped for hours. In one of our local papers the headlines read; "The day the L.I.E. stood still." Our water supply does not come from upstate water sheds. We have a very delicate and valuable underground aquifer. In the event of a "core meltdown" has any study been done to see what would happen to this system and whether or not Long Island would be habitable again?

I believe, and I might add the majority of Long Island's population as well as almost all of our elected local and state officials believe, that we have a unique situation here on the Island. Do you seriously think the future of nuclear energy is threatened by abandoning Shoreham? Or is there some other less legitimate reason this federal agency is pushing so hard against the will of the people?

Shame on you and your commission, stop it now before it goes any further!

Dedicated to a Government
of the People

James W. O'Lear

MAY 01 1987

DOCKET NUMBER PR-58 (2295)
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980)

'87 APR 28 A8:44

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH


April 21, 1987

Secretary of the Commission
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

re: draft rule on nuclear plant emergency evacuation plans

It is the Soviet style of government to have a central commissariat make decisions without regard to the wishes of local government or local citizens. The Soviet nuclear authorities believed the likelihood of a nuclear plant accident was so small that detailed emergency planning exercises were not required - right up until Chernobyl occurred. Can you really be serious in proposing this as the model for us to follow, when everyone knows what the consequences have been? The proposal to allow licensing of nuclear plants without local government evacuation planning can only be approved by a Nuclear-industry Rescue Committee; it will be rejected by anything that can legitimately be called a Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Sincerely,



Walter Epp
5825 Telegraph #51
Oakland, CA 94609

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER **PR-50** **(2296)**
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980) DOCKETED
USNRC

87 APR 28 A8:48

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

183 Gifford Way
Sacramento, CA 95864
April 22, 1987

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Gentlemen:

It is hard for me to believe that you are even considering the possibility of reducing the evacuation zone around nuclear power plants. It probably ought to be expanded instead.

Considering the fact that there is still no safe, permanent storage site for high-level wastes that our nuclear plants are producing, I think that the energy spent on evacuation-zone considerations might better be spent trying to solve some of the other problems that these plants present. I shall not forget Chernobyl: April 26, 1986. I would like to think that your agency knows how the American public feels about the prospect of another such disaster.

Sincerely,

Helen N. Hanna

Helen N. Hanna

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

2297

(52 FR 6980)

MAIL
USNRC

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

'87 APR 28 A8:51

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Commissioners:

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,

Catherine Hankins
Joseph W. Hankins

MAY 04 1987

EAST END SHOREHAM OPPONENTS
Post Office Drawer XXXX
East Hampton, NY 11937

Acknowledged by card

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE

PR-50
(52 FR 6980)

2300

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 APR 28 A8:53

To: Secretary, Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Re: Low-power testing at Seabrook and 10 CFR Part 50
Date: 4/67

Please register my strong objection both to low-power testing at the Seabrook nuclear power plant and to the proposed rule to allow the NRC to issue operating licenses to utilities even in situations where state governors consider emergency evacuation plans inadequate to ensure the safety of the public.

State governors can contribute an important and impartial voice to decisions on evacuation planning. At the Seabrook plant, over 100,000 people gather at nearby beaches on hot summer days, and no one has yet produced a reasonable plan to evacuate them in the event of a major release of radiation. Governor Dukakis should be applauded for refusing to approve unworkable evacuation plans. In doing so he has insisted that the safety of area residents and visitors be placed ahead of the financial interests of the utility involved. A company with a large investment in a power plant cannot be counted on to make such a wise decision, which is why evacuation planning should never rest with the utilities themselves.

On the issue of low-power testing, if the NRC licenses New Hampshire Yankee before the emergency planning debate is resolved, you will send the public the clearest possible message that the Commission is committed to seeing Seabrook go on line at any cost. This is not an appropriate position for a regulatory agency to take.

Thank you for considering and recording my opinion on these issues.

Sincerely,

Francis H. Bouchie 9 Belmont St. Ambury, Ma. 01913
Francis M. Bouchie

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50 (222A)

(52 FR 6980)

DOCKETED
USNRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A8:39

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Rita C. Lindsay
(Name)

196 Raymond St
(Address)

Islip N.Y. 11751
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-50

FRANK H. TEAGLE, JR.

Woodstock, Vermont 05091

(52 FR 6980)

25 April 87

2315

'87 APR 28 P5:28

Secretary:

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC. 20555OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Sir:

I am 73 years old & have lived in Vermont for over 40 years. I wish to register the strongest possible objections to the present consideration of the NRC to allow licensing of Nuclear Plants without State-approved evaluation plans. (10 CFR Part 50)

One of the most important duties of State governments is to protect its citizens. The proposed rule would completely eliminate this power and put the financial benefit of the utilities above the public safety.

If we have learned ANYTHING from 3-Mile Island and Chernobyl it is that emergency planning regulations ought to be Strengthened and not watered down by such capricious action as is proposed.

Most respectfully

Frank H. Teagle Jr

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Box 329

Woodstock, VT

05091

4/20
RECEIVED MAIL PR-52 2327
(52 FR 6980) COLLECTOR SERVICE BRANCH

Dear Sir;

I am writing to express my concern over the plan to change the rule that would remove the requirement for state approval or participation in evacuation planning for areas surrounding nuclear power plants. I am AGAINST the proposed rule change [10 CFR part 50] and would hope that you do not change this rule. The change would make it dangerous to have nuclear operations w/o adequate emergency evacuation plans. It would make it impossible for state governments to protect their citizens. AGAIN, please DO NOT change the rule that requires adequate emergency evacuation plans and an adequate evacuation zone. ~~MA~~

Pc Box 701
Rillingsford, NH 03869

MAY 04 1987

acknowledged by card.....

Sincerely,
ED DELHAGEN

(52 FR 6980)

2390

April 22, 1987

Po Box 198 Hillview St.

East Schodack, N.Y.
12063

'87 APR 28 A9:11

Secretary Samuel Chubb

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SECRETARY'S SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Secretary Chubb,

I am writing to ask you not to make the regulatory change that will take away the rights of states to set emergency planning standards for evacuation in case of a nuclear accident. Seeing the disruption caused by the loss of one Thruway bridge makes me shudder to contemplate a possible Shoreham accident.

I believe that a majority of citizens want their state governments to have authority in this matter. Consider whether you want to allow the utility companies this power when they have shown such irresponsibility and poor judgement in the past. One glaring example of this is the Cost overruns and shoddy workmanship at Nine Mile II.

Please reconsider.

Thanks you.

MAY 04 1987

Sincerely,
Anne Smith

14223 Baswell Blvd.
San City, Arizona 85351
April 20, 1987

DOCKETED
JENRC

87 APR 28 A9:59

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the Secretary
Washington, D.C. 20555

DOCKET NUMBER
EXEMPTED RULE PR-50
(52 FR 6980)

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

2331

Dear Sir:

The plan to weaken emergency planning procedures for evacuating nearby populations in the event of a nuclear power plant "happening" such as Three-Mile Island or Chernobyl is much too worrisome.

My wife and I believe this is a capitulation to the nuclear industry and an attempt to license Shoreham and Seabrook, both of which should never have been in the first place.

We cannot buy the argument that the risk of an accident is "very small." There have already been thousands of mishaps at nuclear plants, any one of which barely escaped turning into a meltdown. The safety record of the nation's plants is not one to inspire confidence.

Moreover, local authorities have not, and in many cases ~~been~~ ^{can} not planned evacuation procedures, and the growing population of the nation does not make these matters better. Just how many lives are we prepared to sacrifice to the nuclear genie which, having been loosed, does not look too benign to us.

Yours very sincerely,

William Karp

Mildred Karp

Jackie Karp

MAY 04 1987

VIRGINIA H. EYSTER

87 APR 28 A9 09

2119 EVERGREEN RD.
TOLEDO, OHIO
43606

OFFICE OF
DOCKET

DOCKET NUMBER PR-50 Easter-1987
~~PROPOSED RULE~~ (52 FR 6980) 2335

N.R.C.
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

Re:

Licensing of Nuclear Power Plants
Where State or Local Governments
Decline to Cooperate in Emergency Planning

HOW COULD YOU ONLY ASK UTILITIES
TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY HAVE
TAKEN "REASONABLE" MEASURES RE
SAFETY REQUIREMENTS?

WERE TALKING NUCLEAR HERE.
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS SECOND-
ARY TO DESIGN? PLEASE,

WE NEED GREAT PEOPLE OF VISION
AT THE NRC. LET IT BE YOU!

VIRGINIA EYSTER

MAY 04 1987

2119 EVERGREEN RD
TOLEDO, OHIO 43606

DOCKET NUMBER
~~PROPOSED RULE~~ PR - 50 (2226)
(52 FR 6980)
DOCKET
USNRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A9:59

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

*I'M SCARY
BUT I DON'T
AGREE WITH
THOMAS DOWNY OR ABOVE*
*C.J. Wilkins
15 Elm Drive
Hauppauge, N.Y. 11788
C-J Wilkins
4/23/87*

(Name)

(Address)

(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

2243

PROPOSAL RULE PR-50
(52 FR 6980)

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 P5:20

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Missileen Norman
(Name)

32 Cordell Ave. Amity Herk Co
(Address)

Amityville NY 11701
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER **PR-52** **2245**
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980)

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A9:39

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Spencer Perabaker
(Name)
60 Taylor Ave
(Address)
N. Babylon NY 11703
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

(2246) DOCKET NUMBER PR-53
PROPOSED RULE
DOCKETED (52 FR 6980)
USNRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A9:39

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.


Sincerely,

Thomas Passafium
(Name)
60 Taylor Ave
(Address)
N. Babylon NY 11703
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 12 1987

acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.



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

DOCKET NUMBER PR-50
PROPOSED RULE (52 FR 6980) 2303
OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

To: The Nuclear Regulatory Commissioners

PATRICIA H. DE MARIA
894 OAKWOOD DR
SOUTHOLD NY 11971

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,

Patricia H. De Maria

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

Acknowledged by a/c

MAY 6 1987

The Nuclear Regulator Commission
Washington, D.C.

Att Docketing and Service Branch.

'87 APR 28 P5:20

Dear Sirs;

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

I feel very strongly that the
Seabrook and Shoreham nuclear generating
stations and equipment are adequately super-
vised by the Federal Government and
should be put into operation immediately.

I feel further, the sincerity of the
State of Massachusetts officials, and some
Federal Government politicians too, is highly
questionable. I feel that their opposition is
generated by their personal ambitions, be
it to get into political offices or to upgrade
their political positions. It leaves me very
much ashamed of them.

Walter J. Canon
57 Sylvan Street
Danvers
Massachusetts 01923

April 16, 1987

Acknowledged by card... MAY 04 1987

To Whom It May Concern:

'87 APR 28 P5:54

I have been reading recently of the problem involving the opening of the Seabrook N.H. Nuclear Power Plant.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

My understanding is that evacuation plans must be implemented before a license be given for its opening; and that Governor Dukakis is politicking because of the obvious cost to consumer once the plant comes on line.

My personal feelings are that if Nuclear Power Plants meet all the safety requirements including an emergency evacuation plan they should be opened no matter what measures must be taken; but as an advocate for the good of all, I believe that the Federal government and you its agency be responsible for insuring that any cost overruns be absorbed by you, or the companies responsible for same.

I am absolutely in favor of any kind of program that will insure our independence in energy; but if the expense be the same as dependence on other countries why bother.

Sincerely yours,
John R. Sprague
26 Lake St.
Boston, MA. 02129

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card

'87 APR 28 A11:32

24 April 1987

OFFICE OF
 DOCKETING
 BRANCH

Secretary
 US Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
 Washington, D.C. 20555
 Selecting & Service Branch
 - 10 CFR Part 50.

Dear Sirs:-

It is alarming to think you have
 learned nothing from Chernobyl.

I find it irresponsible to allow
 nuclear plants to get licensed
 when they have no proven plans
 for evacuation.

We in NY need state protection
 from a accident at Shoreham.

yours truly,

Mrs. Virginia R. Losen
 175 W. 93 St.
 NY NY 10025.

MAY 04 1987

DOCKET NUMBER PR-52 (2257)
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980)

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

'87 APR 28 P4:03

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Commissioners:

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,

Nancy Lynne
97 Wickinley St
Massapequa Park,
NY 11762

EAST END SHOREHAM OPPONENTS
Post Office Drawer XXXX
East Hampton, NY 11937

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR 50

2234

(52 FR 6980)

NRC

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A8:41

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

I disagree with his proposal - the plant should be given a chance to operate with extreme caution & control to Phase

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state ~~my strong opposition~~ to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to ~~amend its rules~~ regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

it can succeed -

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

~~I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.~~

~~I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.~~

Sincerely,

Joan Seaduck
(Name)

651 Sunset Pl
(Address)

Amityville NY 11701 3601
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE **PR-50** **2225**
(52 FR 6980)

April, 1987

'87 APR 28 A9:19

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1121
1717 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

NRC PROPOSED RULE 10 CFR PART 50

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to state my strong opposition to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to amend its rules regarding offsite emergency planning at nuclear power plant sites.

There are absolutely no circumstances where the NRC should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the NRC's current emergency planning requirements.

I believe that my health and safety, and that of my family, are of paramount importance.

I urge the NRC Commissioners in the strongest possible way not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Mark Atkinson, Jr.
(Name)

452 Bohemia Hwy
(Address)

Superville, Ky 40382
(Town, State, Zip)

MAY 04 1987

Acknowledged by card.....

Please fold along this line, and return to me before April 24.