81

-50

(52 FR 6980) 3071

DOCKETED USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P6:49

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

April 28, 1987

Dear Sir:

I am in favor of the proposed change in rules for the licensing of Seabrook Station in Seabrook New Hampshire.

I feel New Hampshire Yankee has the public's best interest at heart. Proof of this is their continuing attempt to work with the opposition on emergency planning.

Seabrook Station was designed and built by individuals who have children and grandchildren. I have all the faith that these people would not put their families in any danger.

8705120336 870505
PDR PR
50 52FR6980 PDR

DS10: 10

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

Acknowledged by card.

I am confident Seabrook Station is the safest Nuclear Plant, perhaps in the world, in part due to the extensive rules set up by the United States N.R.C.

It appears to me that Seabrook Station has been a political scapegoat.

It is being used by certain politicians as a scare tactic to acquire media recognition.

Most of the people opposed to Seabrook are being fed altered information by their leaders.

It would be a disaster in itself, to delay Seabrook licensing any longer, when the economy of this part of the country needs it so desperately.

Once again, I am in favor of the proposed change in rules, so Seabrook Station can finally go on line.

Respectfully

Constance W. LeBlanc
Black Buoy Road
Goffstown, N. Hamp.
03045

DOCKETED USNRC

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

30.32

'87 MAY -5 P6:51

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

'87 MAY -5 P6:51

438 Tinkham Rd
Springfield, MA 01129
April 28, 1987

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, D.C. 20555
Attn: Docketing & Service Branch

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to notify you of my support for the proposed modification of the NRC regulations, called to my attention in a letter of Apr. 3, 1987 from the Coalition for Reliable Energy.

Sincerely,

Arthur H. Woodworth

ARTHUR H WOODWORTH
438 TINKHAM ROAD
SPRINGFIELD MA 01129

DS 10 / 1/0

Acknowledged by card.

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

30.34

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:36

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Gentlemen:

I am in favor of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission proposal to modify its regulations to bring Seabrook on line.

Yours Truly

George Cohen
23 Pederson Rd
Natick, Ma
01760

Acknowledged by card.

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

(30.36)

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:49

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Robert C.
Emily E. Pound

7 Sedgemeadow Rd.
Wayland, MA 01778

4/29/87

BOTH MY WIFE AND I
SUPPORT MODIFICATIONS OF
REGULATIONS TO ALLOW
OPERATION OF SEABROOK
NUCLEAR POWER STATION
ON A FULL TIME BASIS
AND TO CONTRIBUTE TO
OUR ELECTRIC NEEDS.

WE CERTAINLY FEEL THERE HAS
BEEN ENOUGH HARASSMENT & LAW
BREAKING, COSTLY PROTESTS BY
A MINORITY GROUP.

THANK YOU

Robert C Pound
Emily Pound

Acknowledged by card.

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50
(52 FR 6980) (30.39)

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P8:13

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

IO Cross St.
Beverly, Mass.
April I8, '87

Dear Sirs,

I live within 25 miles of the Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, and I want you to know I am very much in favor of having it go on the line; the sooner the better.

If the N R C proposal to modify its regulations in order to accomplish this is what it takes, then I hope such action will be taken.

I feel that too much negative publicity has appeared in the Media concerning Nuclear Power, and very little positive publicity. I am disgusted by the stand taken by my own Governor, and the road-block he has thrown up concerning Seabrook Station. I can,nt understand why more publicity about the successes of Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.A. as well as throughout the World is'nt being brought about by newspapers and T V . One good example to me is Yankee Atomic Station in Rowe, Mass. On The line for over 3I years without any real radiation probems.

I watched a facinating one hour T V documentary on N. B. C. network on March II, I987 called "Nuclear Po wer ; In France it works". To me this was much more positive than negative, and shows how hard France is working to make Nuclear Power safe. I hope that N. B. C. will present this again soon and at an earlier hour so more people will see it. On Mar. II, it was shown at IO P M to II P M . E. S. T. I hope that everyone concerned about Nuclear Po wer will have an oportunity to see it.

I hope to see more people get behind Governor Sununu of New Hampshire (one of our most courageo us Public Citizens) and help him to get the Seabrook Station on the line.

Fromm all that I have heard about Mr. Edward Brown (in charge at Seabrook) he is well Qualified for the job. With him at the helm, I have no fears about Seabrook Station going on the line. The problems at Nuclear Power Stations arise when no one is responsible.

Please do everything you can to enable Seabrook Station to get on the line.

Sincerely Yours,
Edward S. Grant

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

(3041)

Philip T. Boivin
10 VIECKIS DRIVE • NASHUA, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03062

DOCKETED
USNRC

May 1, 1987

'87 MAY -5 P7:58

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

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

Gentlemen:

I urge you to vote in favor of the proposed rule change which would allow the licensing of nuclear power plants where state and/or local governments decline to cooperate in offsite emergency planning. Seabrook Station in particular is built in compliance with NRC requirements and is now held hostage by politicians in Massachusetts. New Hampshire Yankee has worked in good faith with the NRC in the construction and licensing of Seabrook, and has made a good faith effort to work with local and state officials to develop emergency evacuation plans. New Hampshire citizens are becoming a victim of the political process. Politicians are interfering in the licensing of a safe nuclear generating plant built in accordance with NRC requirements. This is irresponsible on their part.

Please allow the proposed rule change. Seabrook is a safe and well built plant. New Hampshire Yankee remains committed to work voluntarily with any town in the ten-mile emergency planning zone. New Hampshire citizens need the support of the NRC on this rule change.

Sincerely,

Philip T. Boivin

Philip T. Boivin

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50
(52 FR 6980) (3042)
DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:59
OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

N.R.C.
Docketing + Service Branch.

April

Sir,

I am writing in support of your proposed modification of regulations to assure ~~that~~ your commission has the sole power to license and approve start up + control of nuclear power plants. I believe ~~that~~ the local governors, or senators have had their say in the original planning for each plants and ~~that~~ the Federal government has the expertise to control the operation + construction not the politicians who probably don't know a fuel rod from a reactor core. I believe that this is a national issue + should be handled by the national commission - not by ~~the~~ local politicians who are pressured by anti nuclear groups.

thank you.

James Coyle

JAMES J. COYLE
14 NONOTUCK ST.
NORTHAMPTON, MA. 01060

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

(3043)

'87 MAY -5 P7:59

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

574 Merrimack St.
Manchester, N.H.
May 1, 1987.

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

Dear Sirs;

We need a rule that would allow the NRC to permit licensing of plants when the state or local governments will not cooperate in off site emergency planning.

Yours truly,

Florence Q. Amadon

Acknowledged by card.....

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

(3044)

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P8:04

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
ATTN: - Docketing & Service Branch

Gentlemen:

As a former senior engineer and Director of the Massachusetts Division of Occupational Hygiene, I would like to go on record in favor of your proposed modification of your regulations which should resolve the present local problems and permit the operation of the newly constructed nuclear power plants.

Very truly yours
Harold Bayley

HAROLD BAYLEY, P.E.
45 Parkway Crescent
Milton, Mass. 02187

Acknowledged by card.....

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

(3046)

MR. RUSSELL MACK
108 PORTSMOUTH AVE. APT 20
EXETER, NH 03833

April 29, 1987

DOCKETED
USNRC

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington D.C. 20555
Docketing & Service Branch

'87 MAY -5 P7:43

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Sirs:

Nuclear power is necessary now as the energy output of electricity is and will be unable to keep up with our demands without it.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is justified in removing the veto power of state opposition to the proposed modification of your regulations.

Our Nuclear Power Stations now proposed, are better built than most of those in operation around the world which have had no problems.

The cost of nuclear plants would have been much less, if those in opposition had not used their scare tactics and had allowed construction when first started instead of causing constant delays.

Sincerely
Russell D. Mack
Exeter, N.H.

Acknowledged by card.

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50
(52 FR 8980) (3047)

W. HARDY PRENTICE
11644 HARBORVIEW DRIVE
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44102

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P8:23

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

April 24th 1987

U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission
attn Mr Samuel J Chilk, Secretary:

Dear Sirs:
I urge you to adopt the rule changes elucidated as 10 CFR Part 50 in the Federal Register Vol 52 No 44.
The abuse of we consumers by three generals who all are playing pure political gain should be stopped. The willful non cooperation of political subdivisions of our country should not be allowed to blackmail your Commission or we consumers.

Sincerely
W Hardy Prentice P.E.

Acknowledged by card

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

(3048)

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P8:13

May 1, 1987

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Sir -

I am in favor of Seabrook Nuclear Power for to-day and the future.

"Sincerely"

Claudio Re Santi
6 Highland Ave.
West Boylston, Mas. 01583

Acknowledged by card. . . .

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

(2931)

'87 MAY -5 P7:07

April, 1987

OFF. DOCK.

29 April 1987

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

Attn: Docketting 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)

_____
(Address)

_____
(Town, State, Zip)

The following form letter was received at my home using franked mail. It was sent by Rep. Downey.

I disagree with this use of the franking privilege. I also disagree with the contention that the Nrc should ~~be over-ruled~~ NOT CHANGE ITS RULES IF IT FEELS IT NEED FOR IT.

I believe that the governments of Suffolk County and the State of New York have not properly evaluated the evacuation program proposals and have instead actively thwarted attempts to make the tests needed. Accordingly I am in agreement with the proposed rule change. The stalling tactics and harassment generated by the above government bodies do not appear to me to be in the best interests of Long Island.

The governments should be instructed to cooperate and develop the necessary evacuation plans, and if that can't work then another body should be designated to undertake that task and try it.

I believe the opening of Shoreham should be encouraged, with all due consideration for safety. The local governments' obstructive policies appear more motivated by political gain than the well-being of their constituents - both with respect to the lack of an alternate evacuation plan, and with respect to the pending shortages of electric power or higher costs of importing such. The governments' actions seem contrary to both the near-term and long-term interest of the LI public.

J. Dale
23 Forest Ave
W. Babylon
New York 11704

J. Dale
23 Forest Ave.
W. Babylon, N.Y. 11704

DS10: s line, and return to me before April 24.

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

MAY 16 '00 15:10 PU1

01571 RDM

01571 MOORESTOWN NJ 05-05 1104A EST MAIL
/IP

Rpt By MGM Via CRT

Opr_____ Time_____

TO	DA/BSY
TIME	DA/BSY
BY	DA/BSY
DISPOSITION	DA/BSY

U S NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ATT DOCKETING AND SERVICE BRANCH
1717 8 ST NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON DC 20555

Fax 202-634-3319
156p-419 5/5

4-0053668125 05/05/87

TDMTZZ CSP
4137372680 FRB TDMT WEST SPRINGFIELD MA 70 05-05 0919A EST
TDMTZZ
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ATTN DOCKETING AND SERVICE BRANCH
RPT DLY MGM
1717 8TH ST NW
WASHINGTON DC 20555

THIS IS A CONFIRMATION COPY OF A MESSAGE ADDRESSED TO YOU

I STRONGLY URGE THE NRC TO ADOPT THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING REGULATIONS WHICH WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE NEAR FUTURE. AS A NATIVE NEW ENGLANDER, I KNOW WE NEED TO BRING ON LINE THE NEARLY COMPLETED NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS SUCH AS SEABROOK AND SHOREHAMT. THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS WILL PROVIDE A MECHANISM TO DO SO WHILE PROHIBITING THOSE OF POLITICAL INTENT TO USE THIS ISSUE FOR THEIR OWN SELFISH INTEREST.

JOHN A PELLI WESTFIELD MASSACHUSETTS
PO BOX 180
WEST SPRINGFIELD MA 01090

1008 EST
>(EX/>151).

00679A125 1014EST

ACCEPTED
01571

1-PC

'87 MAY -5 P5:34

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Acknowledged by card.....

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

-2938

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:35

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

2 Kent La.
S. Farmingdale, NY 11735
April 29, 1987

Mr. Samuel Chilk
Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Attn: Docketing & Service Branch

Dear Sir:

I urge you and the NRC to adopt the proposed new rule change which would allow operation of a nuclear plant which has met all NRC licensing procedures, has n acceptable evacuation plan, but is stopped under present procedures if the state or local communities will not cooperate in evacuation drills.

Should Congress want states to set nuclear policy, let it pass a low. The Commission has delayed too long in restoring its authority.

Very truly yours,

Alberta Hyde

Alberta Hyde

DOCKET NUMBER PR-50
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980) 2939

BBC Brown Boveri
Nuclear Services, Inc.

BBC BROWN BOVERI

9190 Red Branch Road
Columbia, Maryland 21045
(301) 964-3210

DOCK US

'87 MAY -5 P4:31

OFFICE OF DOCKETING BRA

May 1, 1987

The Honorable Lando W. Zech, Jr.
Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Re: Emergency Planning Rulemaking, March 6, 1987, Federal Register

Dear Chairman Zech:

BBC Brown Boveri Nuclear Services, Inc., wishes to provide its rationale in support of the NRC's proposed amendment to the Emergency Planning Regulations.

Our reading of Congressional intent in 1980 was to authorize NRC's issuance of operating licenses to nuclear plant owners that have provided satisfactory offsite emergency planning, even if local and/or state officials refuse to participate in demonstrations of these plans. To do otherwise gives de facto veto power by local authorities over nuclear plant licensing, a power exclusively vested in the NRC by the Atomic Energy Act, as amended.

Obviously this is a politically-charged subject upon which much heat, but little light, has been focused. In spite of the political posturing to which you have been subjected, NRC has no choice, under the law, but to act responsibly in issuing an operating license when all requirements have been met. The regulation for emergency planning should be amended, as proposed, to require that the applicant demonstrate that adequate public protection "...can...be provided." The present additional requirement that adequate public protection "...will be provided," goes beyond the influence and responsibility of the applicants, unfairly penalizing them.

Even if some state and local authorities claim that they will not take action in an emergency, we find it difficult to believe that they will, in fact, fail to meet their responsibilities. In the final analysis, the public will not tolerate irresponsible behavior and inaction on the part of its elected officials.

Sincerely,

Bernard J. Snyder

Bernard J. Snyder, Ph.D.
Vice President & Technical Director

BJS/cmw

DOCKET NUMBER PROPOSED RULE PR-50 (52 FR 6980) 3004

DOCKETED USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P8:52

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

Paul W. Walter, Jr.
72 Housatonic Street
Lee, Massachusetts 01238

SPRINGFIELD, MA PM 1987

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, DC 20555

ATT: Docketing + Service Branch

4-28-87

Sir:

Please implement the "realism rule." It is absurd to give locals a veto over multi-billion dollar plants that have already been built. (Any veto should have been before general work broke). ¶ There is far too much fear-mongering among U.S. politicians. Seabrook + Shoreham are safe + save imported oil.

Yours, Paul W. Walter

INTRUSION IN ENGLISH
Berkshire Comm. College

Acknowledged by card.

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

(300.7)

April 27, 1987

SECRETARY
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMM.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555
ATTN: DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

'87 MAY -5 P7:26

DEAR SIRS:

IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT MASSACHUSETS GOVERNOR DUKAKIS HAS REFUSED TO SUBMIT AN EMERGENCY EVACUATION PLAN OF HIS OWN, CAUSING MORE DELAY AND FUTURE ADDED EXPENSE TO THE CUSTOMER, I AM IN FAVOR OF THE NEW RULE.

THE NEW RULE AS I UNDERSTAND, WOULD ALLOW A PLANT (SEABROOK) TO OPERATE IF THE UTILITY DEVELOPS A PLAN THAT COMPENSATES FOR THE LACK OF GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IN OFFSITE EMERGENCY PLANNING. THIS THEN SHOULD STOP DELAYS AND PUT SEABROOK TO WORK.

VERY TRULY YOURS
Jocelyn P. Soderberg

JOCELYN P. SODERBERG
63 WALNUT ST
MANCHESTER, N.H.
03104

Acknowledged by card.

DOCKET NUMBER PROPOSED RULE PR-50-3008
(52 FR 6980)

April 27, 1987

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:27

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Reg. Comm.
Washington D.C. 20555
Attn. Docketing & Service Branch

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to inform you of being in favor of the new rule, that would allow a plant (Seabrook) to operate, if the utility develops a plan that compensates for the lack of governmental cooperation in offsite emergency planning.

This rule seems applicable in view of the fact that Massachusetts Governor Dukakis has refused to submit an emergency plan of his own, causing more delay, also adding future expense to the customer.

Put Seabrook to work, no more delays.

Very truly yours,
Elmer N. Soderberg

ELMER N. SODERBERG
63 WALNUT ST.
MANCHESTER, N.H. 03104

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50 (3013)
(52 FR 6980)

'87 MAY -5 P6:43

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

May 1, 1987

Members of the N.R.C.

I would like to see the proposed modification of regulations implemented so that Seabrook and Shoreham Nuclear Power Stations can be put on line.

Lets keep O.P.E.C. from getting a strangle hold on us again.

Thank you

Frederick C. Middleton
Mary E Middleton
17 Cliff St.
Malden Ma. 02148

Acknowledged by card.

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

(3015)

Herman C. Carlson
145 Blue Hill Drive
Westwood, Massachusetts 02090

April 28, 1987

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

'87 MAY -5 P6:55

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Commission Members:

I would like to express my support for your proposed regulation modification which would make it easier for qualified utilities to obtain an operating license in those cases where local and/or state governments fail or refuse to cooperate with emergency planning procedures.

In particular, the tactics and arguments used by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with regard to the Seabrook Nuclear Power Station are appalling and devoid of any reasonable merit.

The need for a baseload plant such as Seabrook has been clearly documented by numerous respected forecasters of electrical requirements during the next decade. Moreover, cogeneration and conservation measures, while definitely of some value in our region's overall energy picture, simply can not satisfy the projected capacity needs.

In conclusion, I strongly believe Seabrook must come on line and I urge you approve and promote its start up at the earliest practical date.

Yours truly,
Herman C. Carlson

Acknowledged by card.

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

(30.17)

'87 MAY -5 P6:39

154 Knowlton St.
Manchester, N.H.
03103

May 1, 1987

Dear Mr. Secretary,

My wife and I are in favor of the new rule that would enable the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to license the Seabrook Station in New Hampshire without the cooperation of the Governor of Mass. who chooses not to submit his plan for an offsite emergency.

Seabrook certainly is a safe plant and should be on the line as soon as possible. Please allow Seabrook to operate in the very near future.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene W. Shappell

Acknowledged by card

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50
(52 FR 6980)
(3018)

'87 MAY -5 P6:40

May 2, 1987

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

I would like to give my support for the NRC's proposed change. I believe that we don't have much choice and it is one of those necessary evils. As long as we continue to overpopulate, over build, make continous advances in technology + people who have to have every gadget known to man in their homes the supply of electricity just isn't going to be there. The demands are to great and educating the public to conserve on the use of electricity is next to impossible. The success of Seabrook is something that will depend totally on those who run it and that responsibility can never be neglected in anyway. Although this may be a great deal of responsibility to put all our lives in the hands of a particular group of people it doesn't mean it can't work out to our advantage.

Sincerely,
Elaine Harkins

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50 (3020)
(52 FR 6980)
April 30, 1987

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P6:58

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

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

Gentlemen:

It is my understanding that a proposed change in rules vote will soon be taken.

I wish to make it known to you that I favor any rules change that would allow the licensing of nuclear power plants when state and/or local governments decline to cooperate in offsite emergency planning.

Any and all delays are costly. It is time to put Seabrook to work.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Robichaud

MICHAEL P ROBICHAUD
8 RIDGEWOOD AV
LACONIA NH 03246

Acknowledged by card.

DOCKET NUMBER PROPOSED RULE PR-50 (3021)
(52FR 6980)

DOCKETED USNRC

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON D.C.

'87 MAY -5 P7:18

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I believe it is extremely necessary and prudent that the Seabrook Nuclear Plant be placed in an operational capacity as soon as possible. It is ludicrous that one person (Mass. Governor) can abrogate the ten year process of getting this plant operating. If necessary, I believe the 10 mile radius evacuation circle should be reduced to eliminate this political problem. In this instance too much effort, time, and money has been sunk into this plant to eliminate it, especially when an energy shortfall is on the horizon.

The NRC should exert its national prestige and power and override local (late) opposition to this planned power expansion

sincerely

Earl R Ratliff
5 Brookside Ave
Milford, Mass 01757

Acknowledged by card.

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

3022

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:18

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

DEAR NRC,

I SUPPORT YOUR PROPOSE MODIFICATION OF REGULATIONS WHICH WOULD NOT REQUIRE A GOVERNOR'S EVACUATION PLAN TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE LICENCING CAN CONTINUE.

YOUR CHANGE WILL REMOVE THE STALEMATES THAT EXIST WHEN GOVERNOR'S FAILED TO COOPERATE BY NOT SUBMITTING ANY PLAN AT ALL. I FIND IT VERY UPSETTING THAT A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, WHICH TAKES TEN YEARS TO BUILD, CAN BE HELD UP DUE TO THE VIEWS OF THE (A) NEIGHBORING GOVERNOR (SPECIFICALL, DUKAKIS STOPPING SEABROOK). THE LICENCING PROCEDURE SHOULD BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NRC.

RESPECTFULLY,

Brian Kerrigan

Post Meeting gatherings in
RACHAEL'S and PALM GARDEN
Lounges

573 BROAD ST #230
WEYMOUTH, MA 02189

Acknowledged by card.....

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

(3024)

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:20

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

569 Merrimack St.
Manchester, N.H.
03103

April 30, 1987

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

Dear Sir:

I am very much in favor of the proposed rule change to allow licensing of plants by the NRC when state or local governments do not cooperate.

We need Seabrook as soon as possible. Delays are more costly.

Sincerely,
Maxine A. Hilliard

ACKnowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR-50 (30.28)
(52 FR 6980)

4/28/87

DOCKETED
USNRC

US NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

'87 MAY -5 P7:11

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

The development of nuclear energy as a source of electrical power is essential if the U.S. is to continue to be a world power. The NRC must do everything to take the decision making authority out of the hands of local politicians (also federal if possible). I trust that you will be able to rectify the monstrous error that was made after 3 Mile Island that let the politicians have a veto power.

Sincerely,
Austin and Rita Hamilton

Mr. & Mrs. Austin Hamilton
39 Harriman Street
Manchester, NH 03102

Acknowledged by card.

DOCKET NUMBER PROPOSED RULE PR-52 (52 FR 6980) 3040

DOCKETED USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P7:55

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

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

To Whom It May Concern:

I am in complete agreement with your recently proposed modification of the regulations which would bring the Seabrook and Shoreham Nuclear Power stations on line and help solve the impending power shortage in New England.

The refusal of a minority group in Massachusetts to plan an emergency evacuation route should not jeopardize the need of the majority of the people of New England.

I strongly urge you to break the impasse with your new modifications to insure adequate power to our state.

Sincerely
Fred A. Haerthwein
543 Shore Drive
Laconia, N.H. 03246

Acknowledged by card.....

DOCKET NUMBER PR-50
PROPOSED RULE
(52 FR 6980) = 3052

121 High Rd
Newbury, MA
01951

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P8:16

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

April 29, 1987

To The U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission:

Dear Commissioners

We live in the town of Newbury Massachusetts and within sight of the Seabrook plant.

This is to support you in the modification of your regulations.

We have full faith and trust in your Commission and your experts. We believe your proposal is best for the country.

Yours truly
John S. & Helen D. Casazza

To benefit the Merrimac River Watershed Council
694 Main St., W. Newbury, MA 01985
54 Portsmouth St., Concord, NH 03301

Acknowledged by card.....

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

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 MAY -5 P6:57

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

2 Sw Del Prado
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035
April 26, 1987

Dear Commissioners:

I hope that the Commission will review the emergency evacuation plans submitted to it by Long Island Lighting Company and decide to issue LILCO a license to operate the completed Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant. The premises of LILCO that State and local government will do their parts to effect an orderly evacuation should it become necessary are reasonable despite the political stances taken by those governments. These governments had ample opportunity to make their objections to Shoreham felt when the site was first selected. They did not do so. Now belatedly, due to an irrational fear of radiation, they pander to public fears which they helped create and grandstand for political advantage against the NRC. There is, however, no evidence that Shoreham poses any greater risks to the residents of Long Island than other nuclear plants pose to residents of nearby cities or non-nuclear facilities related to petroleum or chemicals pose to such residents. The fact is that evacuation is possible.

At TMI and Chernobyl, there was time to evacuate in an orderly manner had officials implemented evacuation plans. That would be true on Long Island too, first because Long Island happens to be the densest Metropolitan area in

Acknowledged by card.

the U.S. is not justification to cater to its whims and prejudices. Shoreham should be allowed to operate, if the NRC determines that it can be done safely. State and local government should not be allowed to interfere in what is a federal matter; especially when its argument is specious and when there is a distinct conflict of interest which would permit the State to buy out LILCO at bargain prices.

It is important to note that one year after Chernobyl, very few people have lost their lives and birth defects have not been recorded. Those who are against nuclear power have been misleading the public with scare tactics respecting cancer deaths over the next 50-75 years. Theirs is an emotionally feel cause which can never respond to reason. I urge you to discount their views for what they are.

The U.S. must have nuclear power for the next 3-4 decades at least. Our petroleum supplies are diminishing rapidly and oil imports will increase steadily. We will soon be as dependent on the mideast as we ever were and prices will rise. This will make our trade deficit even worse and reduce our standard of living. That will throw more families into poverty and cause many more premature deaths than Chernobyl. Those who oppose nuclear power have nothing to offer as its replacement other than pie-in-the-sky impractical measures. Attitudes on Long Island and in New England will change very quickly when the next oil crisis hits. They would rather not freeze to death, if that is their option.

Sincerely,

[illegible]