

'87 MAY 28 P5:59

SECRETARY
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY
GENERAL INVESTIGATIVE
DIVISION
BRANCH

RE: Shoreham Nuclear Plant
Long Island, NY

Dear Sir:

I AM WRITING IN PROTEST OF THE
PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE EMERGENCY PRE-
PAREDNESS RULES FOR THE SHOREHAM PLANT.

I HAVE BEEN A RESIDENT FOR OVER 30
YEARS AND HAVE FOLLOWED THIS ILL
FATED PROJECT FROM THE BEGINNING,
ATTENDING OVER 35 HOURS OF HEARINGS
ETC.

YOU HAVE ONLY TO LOOK AT THE RECORDS
OF THOSE WHO HAVE CONSTRUCTED SHOREHAM
TO UNDERSTAND MY CONCERN; BRICKS FALLING
FROM THE DENNISON BLDG. ARE ONE THING;
A POORLY CONSTRUCTED NUCLEAR PLANT IS
SOMETHING ELSE.

WHAT ARE PEOPLE GOING TO COME BACK
TO IN THE EVENT OF A DISASTER? SOME
OF OUR BEST FARMLAND IS IN THAT SECTION
OF THE COUNTY.

THIS ISSUE MUST SUPERCEDE POLITICAL

DS10: 8706080263 870528
PDR PR
50 52FR6980 PDR

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

110

Acknowledged by card.....

AND MONETARY TIES. THE ENTIRE FUTURE
OF THIS ISLAND IS AT STAKE.

YOU SIR, AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF
YOUR COMMISSION HAVE AN OBLIGATION
TO THE PEOPLE OF THIS NATION, AND
THAT IS TO LISTEN TO THEM.

PLEASE, DO NOT ALLOW THESE RULE
CHANGES OR THE LICENSING OF SHOREMAN.

RESPECTFULLY,
Margaret M. Centabar

M. M. Centabar
713 Pease Lane
West Islip, NY 11795

'87 MAY 28 P6:15

Joyce Sobanski
46 Dongan Boulevard
Manorville, New York 11949

OFFICE
DOCKETING
BR

May 21, 1987

U.S. Nuclear Reg. Comm.
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

I am the mother of four children, ages ten to eighteen.

Please do not allow Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant to open up under any conditions. Do not license Shoreham. Do not change your emergency preparedness rules to accomodate Shoreham.

Shoreham was a big mistake; do not compound it by allowing it to open. — sincerely,
Joyce Sobanski

'87 MAY 28 P6:14

DOCKETING SERVICE
MAY 22, 1987 BRANCH
289 W 22 Street
Deer Park NY 11729.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

I do not want any changes made in the emergency
preparedness rules for the Shoreham Power Plant.

Shoreham should never open. Long Island would
be a death trap. Remember this is not Russia.
and the "public" should not be damned"

Patricia Cap

'87 MAY 28 P 6:09

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING BRANCH

Mafalda & Phillip Lowe
115 Rocky Point Road
Rocky Point, N.Y. 11778

Sirs,

It would be unthinkable
that a potentially hazardous
installation (such as Shoreham)
would be permitted to operate
without an emergency plan
approval by State and Local
Government.

Remember Chernobyl!

Respectfully
Mr & Mrs. Phillip Lowe



Mr. Phillip Lowe
115 Rocky Point Road
Rocky Point, New York 11778

MAY 28 P5:33

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
DOCKET BRANCH

ABRAHAM G. GLENN, M.D.
6 KINGS WALK
ROCKY POINT, N.Y. 11778

May 22, 1987

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

I am a practicing physician in Rocky Point, N.Y. approximately 7 miles from Shoreham nuclear plant. I would like to join many thousands of fellow citizens in Suffolk Co., N.Y. to inform your Commission of our very determined opposition to the licensing of the Shoreham nuclear facility. I am particularly protesting any change in the emergency preparedness rules that are currently being considered as proposed by the N.R.C. Please allow a common sense view of the impossibility of any workable evacuation plan in view of the geography of the area involved as well as the opposition of all local + state government units.

Thank you
Abraham G. Glenn

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

4547

ALBERT L. STONE
222 East 24th Street
New York, New York 10010

'87 MAY 28 P4:23

OFFICE
DOCKET

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

Dear Sir:

5/25/87

Please do not alter the rules for emergency preparedness that is a minimum security requirement at this time. It is little enough to expect in terms of our safety and dignity.

Those of us who live within 10 miles of Shoreham are under a constant cloud of fear from simple structural problems that may cause leakage of nuclear radiation or effect other accidents. We must not deviate from the present standards of emergency preparedness. We must hold fast to every safety measure that we have.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Yours truly,

Albert Stone
Mr. and Mrs. Albert Stone

MAY 21 1987
87 MAY 28 P6:15

U.S. Nuclear Regulations Comm.
Washington D.C. 20535

OFFICE
DOCKET

Gentlemen:

RE: LICENSE OF SITOLEHAM
PLANT LONG ISLAND

I AM AGAINST THE LICENSING OF SITOLEHAM PLANT
IN LONG ISLAND IN YOUR NEW PROPOSAL TO CHANGE
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS RULES TO TRY TO MAKE IT POSSIBLE.

THE PROPOSAL CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED ON ANY PUBLIC SAFETY
GROUNDS. THE PROPOSAL RULE RETREATS FROM ESTABLISHED
STANDARDS OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND PARTICULARLY FROM THE
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS OF THE "THREE MILE ISLAND ACCIDENT,"
AND WITH THE CHUNOBAYL DISASTER, STILL FRESH IN
EVERYONES MIND.

THE NRC'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SAFETY OF SUFFOLK'S
CITIZENS IS OF EXTREME INTEREST TO EVERYONE OF US
LIVING ON LONG ISLAND.

VERY TRULY YOURS
Malcolm Gosse
5 Breckin St.
Baylor N.Y.
11706

'87 MAY 28 P5:18

Mrs. Frank Grigoris
24 Washington Avenue
Greenport, New York 11944

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET BRANCH

May 25, 1987

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

Gentlemen:

How dare you! You propose
to change the rules because Skowron
cannot satisfy the emergency requirements!

Our safety should be the
first - foremost requirement!!

Your proposal + attitude is
unbelievable!

How dare you!

Mr + Mrs Frank Grigoris
— Mr + Mrs Stanley Miska

4538

Gerald A. Rogovin / Public Relations

52 Franklin Street Extension
West Yarmouth, Massachusetts 02673
617/775-4714

inc
'87 MAY 28 P5:25

May 19, 1987

OFFICE
DOCKETS

Commissioner Thomas Roberts
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Commissioner Roberts:

Any reduction of the proposed 10-mile safety zone around the Seabrook nuclear power plant will, I submit respectfully, compromise significantly the present and future safety of the nearby communities.

Nuclear power is an extremely dangerous technology, the risks of which are still not sufficiently known, as witness the Chernobyl accident a year ago.

Reducing the 10-mile safety zone reduces the adequate protection of the residents of surrounding communities. The 10-mile safety zone was established, I believe, by the NRC. I implore you and your fellow Commissioners to retain it. As regulators of this technology, you are duty-bound to protect the public safety and welfare insofar as the technology threatens the American public.

I further implore you to maintain the right and necessity of state and local governments to participate in the emergency planning of Seabrook and other nuclear power plants.

Sincerely yours,


Gerald A. Rogovin

Copy: Congressman Gary Studds



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

4534

'87 MAY 28 P5:38

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET CLERK
BRANCH

From the desk of -
DONALD D. STREIT

May 20, 1987

Secretary
Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, D. C.


Dear Sir:

I oppose any change in the 10
mile evacuation rule.

I say no to licensing Shoreham
for any power level whatsoever!

If you think the "garbage barge"
journey to nowhere was a disaster
wait until you try to get rid of
all the nuclear waste from exist-
ing plants. Mark my word. No
place will have it. The cry will
be "put it elsewhere" and "else-
where" does not exist in the
U. S. A.

Yours truly,


Donald D. Streit

DDS:ifs

4530

'87 MAY 28 P4:18

OFFICE
DOCKETING
BRANCH

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

I strongly urge the commission to join the commissioner in opposing the proposed rule change (10 CFR Part 30) allowing nuclear power plants to obtain licenses without state and/or local government participation in emergency planning for radiological emergencies. Please: (1) Stop placing the budget of utility companies above your concerns for the health and safety of the citizens, their children and their Earth. (2) Raise Safety Standards. (3) Follow up and actually enforce standards. (4) Stop shoving nuclear power down the throats of states and local governments who feel their safety is being sacrificed for the profits of utility companies.

Alita Griffen
1200 Peachwood Ln
Bowie Md 20116

Alita Griffen
5th Congressional District


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

4529

'87 MAY 28 P5:25

OFFICE
DOCKET

Noel Cloney
59 Youngskill Road
Huntington, New York 11745



USA 14

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

© 1975 1987

May 25th 1987

To whom this may concern:

I heard that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is thinking of changing its emergency procedures rules so that the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant can open.

The whole idea is ridiculous!! There is no way that the people of Long Island could safely all evacuate if something did happen at Shoreham!! If Shoreham does open and something does happen, the NRC will be responsible for whatever happens and we will select representatives of people who simply Noel Cloney

Acknowledged by card

4528

'87 MAY 28 P5:25

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET MANAGER

New Suffolk NY, 11956

LINDA L. FLETCHER
KIMOGENOR PT., BOX 79
NEW SUFFOLK, NY 11956



Francis Vigo, Vincennes, 1779

Secretary, NRC
Washington DC
20555

© USPS 1984

5/25/'87

Gentlemen:

Regarding the proposal to change
the emergency preparedness rules -

DON'T DO THIS TO US!


although money may talk, our safety
(and perhaps our lives) hang in the balance.
The Edison corporation has made a serious
mistake regarding the Shoreham Nuclear Power
Plant. Like most of us, they must learn
to live with their mistake. Don't make
another mistake to bail them out. You
might have to live with yours, too.
Chernobyl lives on with us still.

Sincerely, Linda Fletcher, New Suffolk, New York.

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

4526

'87 MAY 28 P5:26



SECRETARY
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555



Please know that I am opposed
to any changes in the NRC
licensing requirements for nuclear
power plants, which eliminate
the need for local approval of
an emergency evacuation plan.


David A. Wilcox Jr.
Spaonk, L.I., N.Y.

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

4525

'87 MAY 28 P5:26

MS. ROSE A. KORAN
85 FULLER AVE.
ISLIP, NY 11751



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

attn: Greg Glass

Dear Sir:

The proposed rule change is preposterous.
I think if you don't get rid of
Shoreham — we in Islip are sitting
ducks.

State owner +
tax payer + voter
Rose A. Koran
85 Fuller Ave
Islip, NY 11751

4523

'87 MAY 28 P5:01

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET CLERK
BRANCH

DEAR NRC,

AS CONCERNED RESIDENTS OF ~~S~~ SUFFOLK COUNTY, N.Y.
WE VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE YOUR EFFORTS TO
CHANGE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS RULES TO
LICENSE SHOREHAM.

Sincerely
Rafael Spill
Jane L. Spackolz

Richard N. Spillioz
31 Lloyd Lane
Huntington, NY 11743

'87 MAY 28 P 4:22

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET BRANCH

Dear N.R.C.,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about
your proposed Rule change concerning emergency evacuation
Planning for Nuclear Plants.

I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state
and local government participation in emergency
Planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Thank you

Benny Arcocha — *Benny*

Benny Arcocha

#19 Elmore St.

Central Islip, NY

11704

May 21, 1987

DOCKETED
MAY 28 1987

'87 MAY 28 P 4:43

Blue Ridge Drive
Medford, N.J. 11763

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

I am totally against you making any changes in your "Emergency Preparedness Rules" for any nuclear plants. As for the Shoreham plant here on Long Island, if you ever tried to leave Long Island on a Friday night, you would not be there in no way you could ever evacuate the people here.

Shoreham should never open!!

Cynthia Campbell

4512

Ms. Irene Hansen
28 W. Ford Drive
Oakdale, L.I. NY 11769

'87 MAY 28 P5:14

Sec. Samuel Chalk
Washington DC.

OFFICE OF THE
SOCIAL INVESTIGATOR
BRANCH

Dear Sir! I am writing in reference to the plans of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to propose a change in the rules regarding the licensing of nuclear power plants on Long Island; if passed would have a profound bad effect on the safety of our Island.

I and St. John's Trappers Senior's Club in Bohemia (160 strong) object very strongly against the licensing of Shoreham. This is our home. Our children and grandchildren will be living under a nuclear cloud of fear.

Please reconsider and keep Shoreham closed. Thank you

Sincerely

Ms. Irene Hansen

Legislative Rep. of St. Johns.

'87 MAY 28 P5:42

19 Stackyard Dr
Mastic Beach, NY 11951
May 30, 1987

U.S. Nuclear Reg. Comm.
Washington, D.C. 20555

I am writing this letter over my concerns of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant's opening. I am opposed to its opening and to the NRC's proposed plan to change its emergency preparedness rules. It's evident that there is no feasible way to evacuate Long Island in the event of an accident. Shoreham is outdated and dangerous. Chernobyl and Three Mile Island are two such examples of what the future could hold for Suffolk County. This is a Democratic County and Suffolk County does not want Nuclear Power; the price of our safety is too much to sacrifice.

Jacqueline Vaccaro
Theresa L Vaccaro

'87 MAY 28 P5:41

OFFICE OF DOCKETING
BRANCH

157 Lakeside Trail
Ridge, N.Y. 11961
5/20/87

Secretary

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

To whom It May Concern:

Are you a watchdog agency protecting American citizens or are you a "rubber stamp" for the utilities?

If you are truly an agency which protects the consumer, please see that the emergency preparedness rules are not changed to facilitate LILCO's desire to have the Shoreham plant go on line.

Evacuating Long Island is impossible. In light of Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, I would think that the same approach would be to make emergency preparedness more stringent and not less so.

To do otherwise is madness and irresponsible and makes your job a sham.

Sincerely,
Michael A. Shelley

'87 MAY 28 P5:13

Jack McLaughlin
RFD 4, Old Garrison Rd.
Dover, NH 03820

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET BRANCH

May 24, 1987

Commissioners,

I find your proposal to override state evacuation procedures to be in no ones best interest except the utility companies you so aggressively represent - and it is my feeling the proposal represents a betrayal of your responsibility for the safety of the citizens to whom you were appointed to represent.

As a resident of New Hampshire with a Governor named John Sununu I already know about betrayal of responsibilities. It is with disappointment that this abdication is also under consideration at the federal level.

Sincerely,

Jack McLaughlin

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

4488

'87 MAY 28 P5:51

R.R.1 Box 181
Antrim, N.H.
May 20, 1987

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

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKET: PR-50
BRANCH

Dear Mr. Secretary,

We are grateful to you for extending the comment period on the evacuation rule change that is proposed to allow the licensing of nuclear plants without state approved evacuation plans.

A year and one half ago the D.O.E. proposed 12 eastern sites for burying nuclear waste. Our town is in one of those sites. Because of that proposal, many of us in Antrim learned a great deal more about the nuclear industry than we had ever bothered to learn before. Scarry though these lessons were, we are grateful for this new awareness and we are much more concerned about some of the problems surrounding nuclear power. Our two biggest concerns center around what might happen to the people who live near the plants and what you will do with the nuclear waste manufactured by nuclear plants.

A ten mile evacuation zone around a nuclear power plant really isn't enough to protect the people around that plant should something go terribly wrong. There is strong evidence of people within a 25 mile radius of Three Mile Island being dramatically affected during its "minor accident". We can't understand how the locations for Seabrook and Shoreham plants were approved. Hampton Beach is wall to wall with people sun bathing during the summer, a radiation leak on a hot summer day would be incredibly awful. And Long Island, on a good day that place is hard to escape. If you come up with a good evacuation plan for Long Island, please let us know. We love visiting our family there but the thought of getting to them and away from them (they live in the middle of L.I.) keeps our visits down to once or twice yearly.

We are strongly opposed to the idea of reducing the evacuation zone and to a rule that would strip states of the right to protect their citizens from unsafe nuclear evacuation plans.

Sincerely,

David Penny & Dorothy Penny

David Penny &
Dorothy Penny

'87 MAY 28 P5:41

MAY 19, 1987

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET SERVICE
AL & JOSEPHINE ALIO
34 WOODLAND ROAD
MILLER PLACE, N.Y. 11764

SECRETARY
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

I do not believe that the commission should change its emergency preparedness rules and therefore make it possible for Shoreham to obtain a license to operate. It is obvious to most of us living in the shadow of this plant that our safety would be compromised if this plant were allowed to operate. We appeal to you to keep the safety of Long Islanders foremost in your thoughts and actions.

If you in any way believe that evacuation from this island under emergency conditions is possible, I implore you to simply look at our major highways and secondary roads during regular commuter hours. It is difficult for us to transport ourselves from one place to another, in a reasonable amount of time, during these times.

Please, you have given us the opportunity to comment....

LISTEN !

Concerned Citizens,

Al & Jo Alio
Al & Jo Alio

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

May 13, 1987
P.O. Box 727
Cutchogue, New York 11935

4478

'87 MAY 28 P2:44

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET BRANCH

Dear Sirs:

I understand that you have extended for a month the time for public comment on your proposed rule change which would permit LILCO to operate the Shoreham nuclear installation without an emergency evacuation plan approved by New York and by those of us who are neighbors of this Atomic Titanic.

My wife and I protest this change in the rules in the strongest terms. We find it very strange that this Administration, pledged to get the federal government off our backs and restore state/local prerogatives, has not merely changed the game plan but has tilted the table like a spoiled child when the shareholders of a private utility perceive their investment threatened.

We invite you to join us any day or night on the Long Island "Expressway" or on the lines at the ferries at Port Jefferson or Orient Point. Perhaps a visit to the real world will convince you that the only honest solution is to abandon this ill-starred venture once and for all. Fast evacuation of the Eastern Long Island area was difficult enough when Shoreham was conceived; now it is impossible.

We urge you to act with courage and wisdom so that you do not add the name of Shoreham to the list after Three Mile Island and Chernobyl.

Sincerely,

Frederick A. Ross
Frederick A. Ross

Bette H. Ross
Bette H. Ross

cc: Senator Moynihan
Senator D'Amato
Representative Hochbrueckner

DOCKETED
DATE

'87 MAY 28 A9:18

Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Gary Litvin
GARY LITVIN
387- OCEANSIDE ST
GREAT RIVER N.Y.

I'AM TOTALLY OUTRAGED WITH THE N.R.C.
TO ALLOW THE MOST OUTDATED SYSTEM
TO BE APPROVED BY ANY SAFETY STANDARDS

4470

'87 MAY 29 A9:18

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Nancy Timm
Nancy Timm
115 So Dunton Ave
E Patchogue N.Y. 11772

'87 MAY 28 A9:18

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Agnes Eslava

AGNES ESLAVA

90 Shaw Ave

Islip, N.Y. 11751

'87 MAY 28 A9:18

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Alice Litvin
ALICE LITVIN
240 OCEAN AVE
BAYSHORE, N.Y.
11706

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

4467

'87 MAY 28 A9:18

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

David J Adamo
24 Ocean Ave
DAVID J ADAMO
Bay shore NY 11706

'87 MAY 28 A9:18

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKET MANAGEMENT
BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission


N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,



Lynn H. Litvin
24 Ocean Ave.
Bay Shore NY 11706

DOCKET NUMBER PR-50
PROPOSED RULE (52 FR 6930)
EMERGENCY PLANNING

4463

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Robert Legendre
ROBERT LEGENDRE

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

4462

'87 MAY 29 A9:19

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C


Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,



ELIZ TRAMONTANO
704 Highridge Rd.
N Babylon, NY 11703

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

4458

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C


Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKET MANAGEMENT SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,



Celeste Mihale
894 Thompson Dr.
Bay Shore, N.Y. 11706

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

4457

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Theresa A. Lotito
Theresa A. Lotito
34 Colorado Ave
BAY SHORE NY 11706

4456

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKETING
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Cathy Watson
59-18th ave.
w. Babylon n.y
11704.

LOCKED
DATE

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING AND COMPLIANCE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Abbe Hinkel
141 13th Ave
W. Babylon
NY 11704

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

4453

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555


OFFICE OF THE
DOCKETING AND
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Judy Inhoff
213 Ashwood Bl.
Bayshore N.Y.



◆ Leisure Village and Leisure Knoll

467 Stratford Lane
Ridge, L.I. New York 11961

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

OFFICE
DOCKET
SERIAL
87 MAY 28 PM 18

The Commission:

The licensing of Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant must never be granted to the Long Island Lighting Co. (LILCO). There is no safe way of evacuation in the event of a emergency if the plant was to open.

We are retired and live within a five (5) mile radius of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant. The area is very congested with little access roads. Route's 25A and 25, New York State roads are single lane roads, bumper to bumper on any given day going east and west.

William F. Lloyd Parkway is the main access road leading to the Long Island Express way, which is 5 miles south, Interstate 495. What a joke calling this an express way. It is the worlds largest parking lot.

It seems LILCO has a policy of the public be damned as they are trying all angles to force the opening of Shoreham.

DS10:

(OVER)

111 Sheffield Drive, Ridge, New York 11961 • (516) 744-7600 by card

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

My wife and I are opposed to the rule change on emergency preparedness rules. Don't sell the people on the north shore of Long Island down the tubes just to satisfy LI HCO and its stockholders.

If Shoreham goes on line, heaven help us.

Yours truly,
Robert J & Anne L Hodgens, Sr.

ROBERT J. HODGENS
467 STRAFFORD LN.
RIDGE, NY 11961



'87 MAY 28 P5:37

OFF
FILE
Frank LeCasse Jr.
17 W. Walnut St.
Islip N.Y. 11751
May 23, 1987

Secretary
U.S. Regulatory Comm.
Wash. D.C. 20555

Dear Sir.

I am writing to state that Long Island may be evacuated on the basis of a paper test. But as a life long resident in a real emergency your decision to license the Shoreham nuclear plant would be a disaster to un-told numbers. I am not opposed to nuclear power only their location. Long Island as you know is shaped like a bottle. And all traffic in and out must go through the neck of the bottle. One day 2 summers ago, a tractor trailer overturned on the -

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

10

Acknowledged by card

- Long Island expressway. Would you believe traffic was halted for 14 hours this was in the newspapers. In addition the long Island population swells to almost 2 million people in the summer months. As New York city people head for the hamptons. Can you imagine the hysteria, the panic as everyone flees for the neck of the bottle. Not to mention the mass exodus from nursing homes hospitals the elderly the sick. The road system here is bumper to bumper every morning and every evening under normal conditions And it certainly was out of tune for the traffic that existed maybe 10 years ago.

When Shureman was first proposed, I believe around 1966. The question of evacuation was put to the then called atomic energy commission. Their reply was wait until it's completed then we will discuss it. That's some planning?

The people who built shoreham have been caught red handed falsifying records. Reports of shoddy workmanship from people who worked on the project. The field director of FEMA, Mr. Petrone who would not approve the shoreham plan and was forced to resign or else.

It would seem that the words emergency planning shows fore thought and cooperation between private industry and state government. Without the two acting in concert with each other. The word planning is effectively removed. there is no bond, and we are left with the word emergency, whether or not the authorities would help, is not the question. But how many more lives would be lost because of the delay and lack of a state cooperation before hand?

Additionally, is the NRC, likec and their investors willing to put up some sort of insurance to provide medical care,

Death benefits, survivor benefits, home-owner insurance to the people of Long Island to provide an umbrella coverage to back up their ideas about safe evacuation? I wouldn't drive my car or live in my house without adequate insurance coverage. Would you?

In closing, I implore you to consider this. Put aside your personal interests. And be objective with your own conscience. If you approve a license for this plant, you could also be approving a death warrant. Nothing is foolproof in this world, accidents, human error, mechanical failure it goes on and on, can and do happen. The 19 mile zone around Chernobyl is a dead zone. Three mile island did happen. The cancers these will cause 10 years from now, one could only speculate on

Most Cordially

Frank Leasure Jr

4569

'87 MAY 28 P6:09

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
DOCKET BRANCH

5/24/87

Do not change the rules
to open LILCO Shoreham
Plant! Lileo, in a bill
invest said they would double
my electric bill when Shoreham
went on line & they had a
right to charge the full cost of
Shoreham expenses.

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

1/0

Acknowledged by card

I pay \$100 a month now for
electric & I can't pay \$100 &
live here I will have to
move off Long Island
Meanwhile upstate (water town)
they get the benefit of hydro-
electric power & pay \$30 a
month. Do not put it
on license structure.

Howard P. Zeis Jr

Howard P. Zeis, Jr.
46 Verleye Ave.
E. Northport, NY 11731

GOVERNOR DUMMER ACADEMY

Byfield, Massachusetts 01922

FOUNDED IN 1763

'87 MAY 28 P6:09

DOCKET #
4570

Peter W. Bragdon
Headmaster

May 20 OFFICE
1987 DOCKET
BRANCH

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

Dear Sir:

As faculty members of Governor Dummer Academy, we must publicly voice our concern over the glaring inadequacies of the proposed evacuation plans in the event of a radiological emergency at the Seabrook, N.H. Nuclear Power Plant.

Governor Dummer Academy is an independent boarding/day school of 340 students in Byfield, Mass. -- a town located within the ten-mile radius of the Seabrook plant.

For several years, experts have tried to develop a workable plan covering our town, including our school community. They have reached the conclusion that no such plan can be devised. What this means to us, quite simply, is that we know that it would be impossible to evacuate our students in the event of an emergency at the Seabrook plant.

The inadequacies of the evacuation plans specifically applicable to the Governor Dummer community include:

- 1) The proposed traffic flow will not allow the arrival of buses from outside the emergency zone.
- 2) The bus driver's union has refused to commit itself to sending drivers into a radiological emergency zone.
- 3) The density of the population and the network of quaint, but inadequate, country roads preclude easy or orderly evacuation.
- 4) For the faculty, emergency procedures create unresolvable conflicts with family responsibilities.

We feel these inadequacies to be unrectifiable. Therefore, it is our firm belief that the Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant should not be licensed.

Sincerely yours,

(signed by 48 of a faculty of 51)

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

GOVERNOR DUMMER ACADEMY

Byfield, Massachusetts 01922

FOUNDED IN 1763

Peter W. Bragdon
Headmaster

Signers of the May 20, 1987 letter to the Editor:

Pierre Baratelli

David W. Williams

Elyse A. Buehl

John B. Robb

William H. Spurr

Neil M. Alchisti

Partie T. Hall

Julia Clayton

Stephen C. King

Kimberly Ann Martin

Mathilda Reading

Roberta W. Jordan

Wayland Miller

Norman T. Price

Barbara N. Leavitt

Kenneth R. Casco

Sue A. Dugan

Stephen C. King

James L. Schaeffer

David E. Husama

David C. Husama

Michael A. Moore

Margellen Letvenchuk

Alexander W. White

James J. Kelly

Joanna Gougeon

Albert T. Finn, Jr.

Peter W. Bragdon

Lawrence T. Pistelli

Christopher King

Harold D. Moore

Wallace H. Towne

Garet E. Adams

Kathleen Hall Gray

Edward J. Rydzko

Earl Henderson Mann

John Steel

Peter Allen (by permission)

Karen Licht

Audrey E. Taylor

Robert H. Polzella

Michael A. King

Margaret H. Chedda

G. J. Duff

Pax Aore

Lynda Bromley

Robert Chase

W. A. Thompson

To Whom It May Concern:

'87 MAY 28 P5:39

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WE, MY WIFE AND WHOLE FAMILY, DON'T WANT OR
NEED ANOTHER, "THREE MILE ISLAND", OR WORSE
ANOTHER, "CHERNOBYL". (God Help those People).

Why CAN'T THE LITTLE GUY BE HEARD?

POLITICIANS TELL US WHAT IS BEST FOR US
FROM CRADLE TO GRAVE. AND THAT'S NOT
ALL THAT BAD - SOME PLACES ARE WORSE.

NO SHOREHAM

WE NEVER ASKED FOR IT - WE ARE
EXPECTED TO SAY LIKE IT OR NOT

WE DON'T WANT IT

WE DON'T NEED IT

Don't Jam it Down our throats

You will Be Responsible For
Your ACT

≡ "Continued"

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

1/0

Acknowledged by

WE HOPE + Pray For you Because
you HAVE CHILDREN + GRAND CHILDREN
TOO.

THINK ABOUT them
THIS THING IS NOT ONLY CAUSING
PROBLEMS here ON LONG ISLAND
BUT ALL OVER THE EASTERN SEABOARD

I DON'T HAVE ALL THE ANSWERS
BUT I DO KNOW - NUCLEAR
ANYTHING IS A THREAT.

THINK - THINK - THINK
FOR GODS SAKE

Thank you

MR. JOHN M. LE PORIN

61 FONGE ROAD

RIVERHEAD, N.Y. 11901

P.S. I DO HOPE SOMEONE READS MY
PLEA

'87 MAY 28 P5:52

OFFICE
'87 DOCKETS P5

OFFICE
TELEPHONE
FACSIMILE

Mr. Bethelton Rock
1062 S Thompson Dr.
Bay Shore, N.Y. 11706
May 23, 1987

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

To whom it may concern,

In the May 20, 1987 issue of Suffolk
Life Newspapers it stated that the
citizens of Suffolk County have the opportunity
to express their opinions over the licensing
of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant.

I am surprised and outraged that
the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission would
even consider changing the established safety
rules to fit Shoreham, instead of having
Shoreham conform to minimum safety standards.

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

10

Acknowledged by card.....

Nothing lasting can be gained by
licensing Shoreham despite its obvious flaws.
Moreover, we have everything we love about
Long Island to lose, as seen with the
Chernobyl disaster.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ms. Beth Ann Rock

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

4579

Tracy Leudesdorf
1F State St. '87 MAY 28 P5:43
Leominster, MA 01453
May 7, 1987

OFFICE OF
DOCKET SERVICE
BRANCH

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Dear Commissioner:

We object strongly to the proposed rule change allowing for the elimination of utilities consulting with states and localities. This is a democracy, therefore we have elected officials to voice our opinions, Governors' Dukakis and Cuomo and thousands of protestors are sending the message loud and clear that nuclear power is an untenable source of energy.

Evacuation of Seabrook in case of emergency and surrounding towns is impossible. Chernobyl has shown us the disaster that would occur not only to these towns but across the country.

We must also be responsible now for the nuclear waste we would create rather than leaving the dilemma of tons of stored radiation for the future generations.

It is unfortunate that millions of dollars have been wasted in building nuclear power plants, but at least it is only dollars. Before it is our environment and our lives let us begin developing clean, renewable, non-polluting resources such as sun, wind and water. We have valid reasons for not wanting Seabrook licensed; do not take away our elected officials voices.

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

Sincerely concerned

Acknowledged by card

10

5
Glasco

Christine Shuman

Kimberly Hill

Joan Patel

Clinton, MA

Jim White

Brian (unclear)

Nancy Hale

Caroline Hale

Nancy M Bennett

Ruth E. Dukel

Richard M. Clouty

John J. White

Thomas J. Clouty

Town of Duxbury, Massachusetts
Office of Selectmen



'87 MAY 28 P2:59

DAVID J. VOGLER
Chairman

C. MARTIN DELANO

PATRICIA A. DOWD

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET CLERK

SARAH P. SACCONI
Executive Assistant
Clerk, Board of Selectmen

May 19, 1987 .

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

Dear Commissioners:

The Duxbury Board of Selectmen is writing to urge you not to adopt the proposed rules change in 10 CFR Part 50, which would permit the licensee or applicant to provide its own emergency response plans under certain circumstances. Although the proposed new subsection (e) of 10 CFR 50.47 does provide criteria by which the Commission would determine government non-cooperation, we feel that this option would remove from state and local governments their primary responsibility for the public health and safety of residents.

A thorough review of Duxbury's emergency response plans for the Pilgrim nuclear power facility was conducted during the past year by this board, the town's Civil Defense Director, a citizen review board, Boston Edison representatives, and state and federal officials. One point that emerged from that review was that an emergency response plan that is not based on information about local conditions and local needs and the coordinated efforts of local officials cannot work. We question, in particular, how a federal agency or a private enterprise would be able to be able to make a determination that "applicant's offsite emergency plan includes effective measures to compensate for the lack of cooperation which are reasonable and achievable under the circumstances and which take into account a likely state or local response to an actual emergency." (proposed subsection (e3) of 10 CFR 50.47).

DS10: 1

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

10

878 Tremont Street • Duxbury, Massachusetts 02332 • (617) 934-6586

Acknowledged by _____

Letter to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

May 19, 1987

Page 2

In addition to our ongoing review and revision of Duxbury's emergency response plan, we have discussed the proposed regulation change with the town's Civil Defense Director. He supports our request that you recognize the responsibility of local officials and leave the existing regulations unchanged.

Sincerely,

David J. Vogler)
David J. Vogler, Chairman)

C. Martin Delano) BOARD OF SELECTMEN
C. Martin Delano)

Patricia A. Dowd)
Patricia A. Dowd)

DJV/jg

cc: Senator Gerry E. Studds
Senator William B. Golden
Representative Charles Mann
State Civil Defense
Boston Edison
State Dept. of Public Safety

4576
4576

— May 25, 1987 MAY 28 5:58

OFFICE OF PUBLIC
DOCKETING CENTER
BRANCH

To: The NRC

Please, for the sake of all
of us who live on Long Island,
and for all who live near-by,
DON'T OPEN SHOREHAM!

We've heard all the pro's
and all the con's, and unless
your heart is governed by
nothing except the almighty
dollar, there is no, absolutely
no sane reason to start the
Time Bomb named Shoreham
ticking.

— (over)

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

Acknowledged by card.

Please, don't let the
mighty USA fall victim
to the likes of Chernobyl!

Today, on Veterans Day, when
we honor those who died for
the love of our country, don't
allow us to ~~lose~~ chance death
for the love of money!

I don't fear nuclear energy,
I FEAR SHOREHAM!

Please, Save Us, Save the
Children, Save the Land!

CLOSE SHOREHAM!!!

Thanks for your time!

Ed Dahl

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK



May, 1987

Dear Resident of Suffolk County:

The battle over the licensing of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant has taken a new turn, and there is an opportunity for you to express your views to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The NRC is proposing to change its emergency preparedness rules in order to try to make it possible to license Shoreham. In effect, the NRC wants to eliminate the present requirement for effective emergency preparedness. The reason is that Shoreham cannot satisfy this requirement. The proposed rule change is therefore only another manifestation of the NRC's continuing desire to help LILCO put Shoreham into operation.

NRC Commissioner James Asselstine, who opposes the proposed rule, calls the concept of the proposal "simply nonsense." He points out that the proposal cannot be justified on any public safety grounds. The Federal Emergency Management Agency also finds the proposal flawed. FEMA makes clear that the proposed rule retreats from the established standards of public safety and, particularly, from the emergency preparedness lessons of the Three Mile Island accident.

If the NRC adopts the proposed rule change, Suffolk County will seek to prove that the requirements of the rule cannot be satisfied at Shoreham. If the NRC disagrees with us, the County will challenge the rule in court. The County is committed to protecting the welfare of its citizens. With the Chernobyl disaster still fresh in everyone's mind, the NRC's cavalier attitude toward the safety of Suffolk's citizens is an affront to everyone of us.

The NRC has given the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed rule change by June 4, 1987. If you would like to inform the NRC of your views, direct your comments to the following:

Secretary

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Washington, D.C. 20555

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Blass

Gregory J. Blass
Presiding Officer
Suffolk County Legislature

Michael A. LoGrande

Michael A. LoGrande
Suffolk County Executive

Please Act Now - Send Your Letter Today!

7
Hi;
Edo
(Df
in b.
petit)
F)
aw
rec

Wednesday, May 20, 1987
SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS
PAGE 17 D

DOCKET NUMBER PR-50
PROPOSED RULE (52 FR 6980)
EMERGENCY PLANNING 4461

'87 MAY 29 A9:19


Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,



MERVIL WHORFMAN
57-07 MARATHON PKWY
LITTLE NECK, NY 11362

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

4465

'87 MAY 28 A9:18

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Norma Blumenfeld

Acknowledged by card.

4472

'87 MAY 28 A9:18

OFFICE
DOCK

Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Fucareno
58 Grant Ave.
Fd.p, NY 11757.

'87 MAY 28 P3:04

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

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET CLERK
BRANCH

Dear Mr. Chairman:

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

There are absolutely no circumstances where the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should authorize a full power operating license if the utility cannot meet all of the N.R.C.'s current emergency planning requirements.

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

I urge you and the N.R.C. Commissioners, in the strongest possible way, not to change the rules.

Sincerely,

Paulina A. Zurl
(Name)

7 Rossmore Blvd.
(Address)

East Patchogue, New York 11772
(Town, State, Zip Code)

Salvatore P. Salorenzo
2 Olympia Lane
Stony Brook, NY 11790

DOCKET NUMBER PR-53
PROPOSED RULE (52 FR 6900)
EMERGENCY PLANNING

4483

'87 MAY 28 P4:11

May 22, 1987


OFFICE
DOCK
BRANCH

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

Dear Mr. Secretary,

As a resident of Suffolk County I am against the licensing of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant and therefore I am strongly against any attempt to eliminate the present requirement for effective emergency preparedness.

Thank you,



Salvatore P. Salorenzo

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY 28 P5:54

74 Nichols Road
Nesconset, N.Y. 11767
May 23, 1987

Secretary
OFF
001
MILITARY
SERVICE
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Secretary,

Shoreham, a small village on Long Island, has become a big problem for your conscience. Millions of Americans and a substantial percentage of our nation's productivity is being placed in harm's way. Do not adopt the proposed rule change.

I respectfully caution you and members of the body deciding such change that recent events - both disastrous and technological - leave no doubt whatsoever of the loss of timeliness for such a change. Chernobyl and the superconductivity breakthroughs have made any opportunity for such a change in rules as passed.

Though I can imagine the past economic pressures on you and your commission, do not now force history to judge you delect. Further, do not make more Democrats out of good republicans.

Most sincerely yours,
Norman F. Bohrer

(516) 265-4929

4519

DOCKET
CENTRE

'87 MAY 28 P6:22

OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

5/20/87

NUCLEAR REGULATORY Commission
WASHINGTON, D.C.
20555

Please reject the proposed
change in evacuation
rules.

Thank you

Dennis J. Charnes

Charnes
147 Rocky Pt Rd
Sound Beach, NY
11789

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

4520

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY 28 P6:14

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

5/20/87

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.
20555

Please reject the
proposed change in
evacuation rules.

Paul W. Chanice

Chanice
147 Rocky Pt. Rd
Sand Beach, NY

11789

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

4521

DOCKET
UNIT

5/20/87

'87 MAY 28 P 6:06

OFFICE OF
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.
20555

Please reject the proposed
change in evacuation rule
Thank you

Michael A. Chance

Chance
147 Luby Pt Rd
Sound Beach N.Y.
11789

RECEIVED
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

4527

'87 MAY 28 P5:26

OFFICE
DOCKET
BRANCH



MAY 23 1987

Settling of Connecticut, 1636

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ATOMIC SAFETY & LICENSING BOARD
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

© USPS 1986

168 CANTERBURY DRIVE
RIDGE, L.I., N.Y. 11761
MAY 21, 1987

DEAR SIR:
NEW NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS MUST NOT
BE PERMITTED TO OPERATE AT FULL
POWER WITHOUT STATE AND LOCAL APPROVED
EVACUATION PLANS IN PLACE FOR SAFETY OF
LOCAL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS.

Thomas W. ...
Secretary of ...

'87 MAY 28 P5:38

37 Beaumont Ave.
Manhasset N.Y. 11778
May 23, 1987

OFFICE
DOCKET

Secretary to the Commission
N.R.C.
Washington D.C. 20555
ATTENTION: DOCKET CLERK

DEAR N.R.C.:

PLEASE DO NOT ALTER THE RULES
CONCERNING EMERGENCY EVACUATION
PLANNING FOR NUCLEAR PLANTS.

PLEASE DO NOT ELIMINATE STATE
& LOCAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION
IN EVACUATION PLANNING.

I FEEL THAT SAFETY STANDARDS
SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED NOT
WEAKENED.

Sincerely,
Gladys Phelan
(MRS. HAROLD PHELAN)

'87 MAY 28 P2:14


Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.


Sincerely,




Lois Litvin
58 Grant Ave.
Islip, N.Y. 11757

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

Acknowledged by 



'87 MAY 28 P5:30

OFFICE
CLERK

May 22, 1987

The attempt to change the emergency preparedness rules of the NRC is an attempt to place Long Island in the position of total vulnerability.

The safety of my children + my grandchildren come before the needs of the Long Island Lighting Co. + its stockholders.

Please do not change the rules on emergency preparedness.

Fabrica Polut
1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212

DOCKETED
MAY 28 1987

'87 MAY 28 P5:18

OFFICE
DOCKET
BRANCH

April, 1987

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,

Donald A. Warrath
(Name)

3 E. Cherry St.
(Address)

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

44 Sandys Avenue
East Hampton, N.Y.
May 23, 1987

Mr. NRC
Washington, D.C. 20545

87 MAY 28 PM 44
RECEIVED
MAY 28 1987

Dear Sirs
I strongly oppose any change
in the emergency preparedness
rules that may make the financing
of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant
operable. I have lived on Long Island
all of my 52 years & am very
familiar with the roads and
traffic. In my opinion it is
absolutely impossible to evacuate
the area during any type of
emergency. Our safety and the
lives of future generations depend
on keeping the power plant closed.
It is the only sane & moral
decision that can be made.

Yours truly
Nancy Lawrence

4473

'87 MAY 29 A9:18

OFFICE
DOCK
BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Joseph Jucanich
58 Grant Ave.
ISIP NY. 11751.

4460

'87 MAY 29 A9:19

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKET BRANCH

Dear N.R.C.,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,



138 Geneva St
BAYLOR N.Y. 11706

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

4459

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET
BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission


N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,


147 Brook St.
BAYSHORE N.Y.
11706

Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

George F. Spubray
7 Lakewood Ave,
Bay Shore NY

'87 MAY 29 A9:19

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,



11 Cortina Way
Bay Shore N.Y.
11702

'87 MAY 22 A9:19

Secretary of the Commission
N.R.C
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKETING BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Colleen M. Evers
30 Midwood Rd.
U. Babylon NY 11704

Secretary of the Commission

N.R.C

Washington, D.C. 20555

'87 MAY 28 A9:19

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DOCKET NUMBER SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear N.R.C,

I live on Long Island and I am very concerned about your proposed rule change concerning emergency evacuation planning for nuclear plants. I urge you to reject the proposal to eliminate state and local government participation in evacuation planning. I am opposed to this reduction in safety standards.

Sincerely,

Arthur J. Giovanni
80 Hamers Lane
Bay Shore, NY 11706

'87 MAY 28 P5:58 ~~236 Fernledge Drive~~
New Kensington, Pa
15068

OFFICE DOCKETING SERVICE OFFICE DOCKETING SERVICE
MAY 23, 1987

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

Att: Marketing + Service Branch

Gen'l Counsel -

The bullying of the NRC by different groups of uninformed and publicity seeking individuals who find sensation + headline politicians to promote any cause or event (even a figment of imagination) for their dual benefit is both unwarranted and an actual act of sabotage.

There was a documentary aired on TV on the Nuclear Power generation in France that is now 45% nuclear and is moving ahead to 100% in order to become hostage free from the oil cartel. The industry is controlled by one body which appears ideal and practical.

All candidates for employment in the nuclear power sector undergo a rigorous and extensive training period at one central academy and get repeated updates on any future update on problems and solutions that

DS10:

add: P. Crane, H-1035
J. Lane, 266 PHIL

10

Acknowledged by ~~_____~~

may arise. One must graduate in order to be assigned in order to maintain the highest efficiency rate and thoroughly trained to meet any problems.

The training of the general population could start with this film to get a better understanding of nuclear power by introducing it in the education system from grade school thru college, in civic groups, and in labor organization in order to dispel the myth of a destructive force awaiting to destroy the earth.

We know that our resources of other generating fuels is limited or even hampred as example of acid rain. What are future generations to do when the supply is exhausted or limited?

They often comment that the shareholders must bear the costs of extensive delays and cost overruns or that power is no longer needed temporarily. It is gross stupidity to assume that when one desires electric power all they have to do is flip a switch for instant consumption. Electricity is a precious commodity. It is the prime necessity of our way of life.

—

I'm sure that the state of New York that can't even build a safe bridge and cause death + destruction - a simple project can be an authority on a complicated endeavor that takes years of scientific study and development by the top brilliant minds of science and engineering.

That is why we have the NRC!
Likewise the Governor of Mass. now wants to be president but refuses to abide by a Federal ^{agency} ruling and interfere in the rights of another state. Is that his policy of cooperation?

The prohibitive costs that have been escalating are the directly caused by continual delays and failure to put facilities in operation such as Seabrook + Shoreham + others. It is the result of costs that will eventually hit the consumer because a few publicity seeking politicians following blindly a few misfits that make a career of creating controversial issues to build an ego.

All Nuclear development and power generation should strictly be under one direct agency for management and operation to prevent fragmentation to the whims of those without complete knowledge and understanding of a very complex project.

Respectfully yours
Chester S. Heredia

note: Have share holding in 41 utilities.

