

'87 JUL 10 A10:58

OFFICE
DOCKETING
BRANCH

July 2, 1987

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

I am a resident of Suffolk County on Long Island who is constantly amazed at the ongoing battle over Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant. It is quite obvious that no one on Long Island wants the power plant to begin operation.

The local government has proven that there cannot be an effective evacuation of the area in the case of a nuclear accident, and yet the NRC continues to search for loopholes through which they can approve the opening of Shoreham. I think it is absolutely pathetic! And quite disgraceful! There is no question in my mind as to the possibility of an accident at Shoreham. I believe that Shoreham will be the

DS10:

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

8707170011 870710
PDR PR
50 52FR6980 PDR

(over please) →

next Three Mile Island if it is permitted to open. I worked at Shoreham as a Temp for 2 weeks during its construction. I had the misfortune to work as secretary to the engineers. The mismanagement and constant errors I was witness to petrified me. To me, these people were totally incompetent, and they were building a nuclear power plant in my backyard. It is inevitable that Shoreham will have a major accident if permitted to operate because the people who built it were a bunch of assholes and I don't want them entrusted with my life. I was so frightened by the lack of competence at the plant that I quit my job after 2 weeks when I heard rumors that they were bringing in the radioactive fuel for storage until operations began. I quit that day because I believed that my life was being threatened by the incompetence of the Shoreham team. The NRC has no right to license Shoreham when the people of Long Island are strongly opposed to it. I do not want my children born with defects or dying of cancer just because you people are greedy bureaucrats looking after only your own interests. It's time you opened your

- ears and listened to the facts. We do
- not want Shoreham.

The NRC has no right to license the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant. So please stop trying to bend the rules and rationalize this behavior to the people of Long Island. Do what is morally right and deny Shoreham a license to operate.

If you give Shoreham a license to operate, you are giving Lico a license to kill. And surely, God and the people of Long Island cannot sanction murder. Can you?

A Concerned
resident of Long
Island

T. Gentile
4A Whalley St.
Hadley, Ma. 01035

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 JUL 10 A10:59

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

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear NRC,

As a resident of Massachusetts, I am writing concerning the NRC's desire to license Seabrook nuclear power plant in the absence of adequate emergency evacuation plans. Certainly, the communities closest to Seabrook, the ones that face the brunt of any emergency situation that might require evacuation, have the right to approve or disprove any plans for their own evacuation. If you allow the utility companies to design, and possibly implement, their own evacuation plans, the NRC ceases to watch over the nuclear industry and ignores the wishes of the people it was designed to protect. Please do not approve the rule change proposed that would allow Seabrook to be licensed in the absence of adequate emergency planning.

Sincerely,

Terese Gentile

Acknowledged by card

DS10:

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

110

'87 JUL 10 AIO:49

Dear NRC,

I am writing to <sup>OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE</sup> reject the proposed rule that would limit state and local participation in emergency planning.

As a resident of Ma., I am deeply concerned about health and safety of my family and others in the event of an accident at Seabrook Gov. Dukakis and all six towns in the Mass. Emergency Planning Zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unworkable. I stand behind their decision.

Please honor their decision and do not approve this rule change.

Sincerely,

Diana Hoener

D Hoener
289 Elm St
Northampton ma
01060

DS10:

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

110

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

DOCKETED
USNRC

11443

'87 JUL 10 A11:44

Dear NRC

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

I read the story in New England Monthly Magazine — Sununu — Seabrook, the whole bit and I feel like I am in a position to argue a point. Please reject the proposed rule that would limit state and local participation in emergency planning.

I have lived in Mass. all my life, and I am deeply concerned about the health & safety of my family & others in the event of an accident at Seabrook.

Gov. Dukakis and all 6 towns in the Mass. Emergency Planning Zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unworkable. They are. I stand behind their decision.

Please honor their decision and do not approve this rule change

Sincerely,

Bettina Fabos

RECEIVED JUL 10 1987
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

DS10:

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

1/0

Dear NRC,

'87 JUL 10 A11:46

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed rule that would limit state & local participation in emergency planning.

As a resident of Massachusetts, I am deeply concerned about the health & safety of my family & others in the event of an accident at Seabrook. Governor Dukakis and all six towns in the Massachusetts Emergency Planning Zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unworkable. I stand behind their decision.

Please honor their decision & do not approve this rule change.

Sincerely,
Carol Batter
121 North Main St.
Sunderland, MA 01375

DS10:

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

110

Acknowledged by card.

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

11441

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

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 JUL 10 AM 11:46

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear NRC,

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed rule that would limit state & local participation in emergency planning.

As a resident of New Hampshire, I am deeply concerned about health & safety of my family & others in the event of an accident @ Seabrook. Governor Dukakis and all six towns in the Massachusetts Emergency Planning Zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unworkable. I stand behind their decision.

Sincerely

Anne Almarie

DS10:

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

110

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

11440

DOCKETED
USNRC

5 June '87 JUL 10 A1:47

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Secretary

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

Dear NRC:

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed rule that would limit state and local ~~planning~~ participation in emergency planning.

I am a resident of Massachusetts, and am very concerned about the health and safety of my people here in the event of an accident at Seabrook. Gov. Dukakis and all six towns in the Massachusetts Emergency Planning Zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unwarrantable. I support this decision.

Please honor our wishes and do not approve this rule change.

Sincerely,
Celia Cuddy

Celia Cuddy
6 Chesterfield Rd
Amherst, Mass 01002

DS10:

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

Acknowledged by card.

B. Rwest
6 Landers St
South Hadley, MA
01075

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

11439

DOCKETED
USNRC

'87 JUL 10 P3:40

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555
ATTN: Docketing & Service Branch

Dear NRC,

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed rule that would limit state and local participation in emergency planning.

As a resident of MA, I am deeply concerned about the health and safety of my family and others in the event of an accident at Seabrook. Governor Dukakis and all six towns in the Massachusetts Emergency Planning Zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as workable. I stand behind their decision.

Please honor their decision and do not approve this rule change.

Sincerely,

B. Rwest

DS10:

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

110

Acknowledged by Card

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

11438

*My department
will be in the future
and I don't
know if
I can
do it*

87 JUL 10 AM 46

DOCKET
PR-50
EMERGENCY PLANNING

...atory Commission in the event
of a protest of this proposal. It may be
your last chance to have any per-
sonal input into the decision of
whether Shoreham opens or closes.
Whether you will have to live under
the threat of radiation poisoning.
Address your correspondence to
the NRC Commissioners, United
States Nuclear Regulatory Com-
mission, Washington, D.C. 20555. If
you do not have time to write, just
sign your name at the bottom of this
editorial and send it off. They'll get
the message. It's a matter of
life and death. And why not?
The NRC is the only agency that
can protect you from a nuclear
disaster.

*Mr. Brinkley
55 Cypress Drive
San Ramon, N.Y. 11754*

DS10:

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

110

Acknowledged by card

'87 JUL 10 A11:47

Dear N.R.C.

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

I am writing to urge you to reject the Proposed Rule that would limit state and local participation in emergency planning.

As a resident of Massachusetts I am deeply concerned about the health and safety of my family and others in the event of an accident at Sea Brook. Governor Dukakis and all six towns in the Massachusetts emergency planning zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unworkable. I stand behind their decision.

Please honor their decision and do not approve this rule change.

Julie Waggoner

Julie Waggoner
160 Main St.
Wilton Ma. 01890

DS10:

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

1/0

Acknowledged by card.

Dear NRC

I am writing to urge you to reject

The proposed Rule That would limit
state and local participation in emergency

Planning.

as A Resident of MASS., I am deeply concerned
about The health and safety of my family + others
in the event of an accident at Seabrook.

Governer Dukakis and all 6 towns in The MASS.
emergency planning zone have already rejected The
Seabrook plant as unsuitable. I
stand behind This decision.

Please honor This decision and do NOT
approve This rule change

DS10:

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

1/6

Sincerely
Robert J. Tallent

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

11435

DOCKET
NUMBER

'87 JUL 10 A10:50

OFFICE OF
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

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

Dear NRC,

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed rule that would limit state and local participation in emergency planning.

As a resident of Massachusetts, I am deeply concerned about the health and safety of all who would be affected by an accident at Seabrook. Governor Dukakis and all six towns in the Mass. Emergency Planning Zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unworkable.

Please do not override the will of the people closest to the site - Rather than change the rule, it seems fair to continue negotiating a plan that would be relatively safer + more acceptable.

Thank you,

Carolyn Mann

31 Winslow Ave.

Northampton, MA 01060

Goold Farm

Monterey, MA 01245

DS10:

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

110

Secretary

June 8th 1987

'87 JUL 10 A10:49

Dear A.R.C.

OFFICE OF
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed rule that would limit state and local participation in emergency planning.

As a resident of Massachusetts, I am deeply concerned about the health and safety of my family and others in the event of an accident in Seabrook. Governor Dukakis and all six towns in Massachusetts emergency planning zone have already rejected the Seabrook plans as unworkable. I stand behind their decision.

Please honor their decision and do not approve this rule.

Thank you
Vicki Williams

DS10:

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

110

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

11433

June 1, 1987

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

'87 JUL 10 10:51

Dear Sir or Madam,

OFFICE OF THE
DOCKET MANAGER
BRANCH

As a resident of Suffolk County, Long Island, New York, I would like to make my views known to you. I believe that the majority of Suffolk County residents feel as I do.

We do not want a license given to LILCO's Nuclear Power Plant at Shoreham. We believe that Shoreham should not be allowed to operate at any level whatsoever. After reviewing the facts, it is clear that our limited road network and unique island geography make a successful evacuation plan impossible. This means that a power plant accident at Shoreham could result in another "Three Mile Island" situation, this time with millions of people's welfare at stake.

Your proposed change in emergency planning rules would make it possible to license Shoreham, despite the obvious safety problems. Clearly, the change retreats from established standards of public safety and emergency preparedness. As a resident of Suffolk County, I vigorously oppose the proposed rule change.

Please do not consider changing the emergency planning rules, and thereby granting an operating license to Shoreham. If a power plant accident does happen on Long Island, the lives of millions of people will be on the heads of you and others who sit on the NRC.

Sincerely,

James D. Caulfield
Dept. of Philosophy
511 NY, Stony Brook

11794

DS10:

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

110

Acknowledged by card.

418 Main St., Amesbury MA 01913

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

July 7, 1987

11431

'87 JUL 10 P3:44

Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555
Attention: Docketing & Service Branch

Dear Mr. Secretary, re: NRC Proposed Rule Change from 10 mi. to Site Specific EPZ's

We, the undersigned residents of Massachusetts living within 6 miles of a proposed nuclear power plant, are writing to register our strong opposition to the NRC's proposed rule change limiting State and Local authority for emergency planning in the vicinity of new plants. Specifically, we oppose the NRC's call for site specific Emergency Planning Zones and call, instead, for the expansion of minimum EPZs to 20 miles, with site specific data to expand this, and to make local and state approval to be a mandatory part of the licensing process.

We write as thoughtful, concerned, and knowledgeable individuals who have studied the issues concerning nuclear energy, technological innovation, and emergency response here and abroad. Among us we have 2 Ph.D.s, 2 MAs, and 1 MBA. We include an Engineer and retired military officer, a former student of atomic physics, and two international consultants on technology transfer. We have studied the development of the Seabrook power station and the technical, environmental, and local community responses to the problems behind Love Canal, Bhopal, Challenger, and TMI. We have considered our position on the EPZ issue carefully.

Fundamental tenets of our constitution and the democratic process of which we are so proud as a nation are the responsibility of state and local authorities for the health and safety of their people and the right of local citizens to be consulted concerning significant issues affecting their localities. The proposed NRC ruling, dealing with a potentially extremely dangerous technology, flies in the face of both good sense and our democratic traditions.

A minimum 20 mile EPZ should be required, and expanded--but not reduced--on site specific data. "Source term" data upon which the NRC proposes to base its Emergency Planning Zones is not a realistic approach. This data is based on computer models rather than real-life data and local experience. Chernobyl and TMI have both given ample evidence that accidents can and will occur that are far more serious than the industry claims can happen. Local authorities must be given the authority to plan for such eventualities. As those of us familiar with science and technology are well aware, "Murphy's Law" is too frequently a reality with which we must deal.

The attitude of the NRC toward the emergency planning issue is of grave concern. It suggests that the promotion of nuclear power has taken precedence over prudent planning for the safety of the citizenry. Had there not been two serious nuclear accidents in recent years we might understand, if not agree with, their efforts to by-pass local authorities. A citizen petition calling for a 20 mi. EPZ was presented to the NRC in 1981 and has had no consideration for 5 years. Another has been presented to the NRC recently which, in our personal experience, is being signed enthusiastically by at least 75-85% of all who have the opportunity to see it. In our own neighborhood 72 out of 75 residents unhesitatingly endorsed it.

The NRC seems to be operating more like a USSR state planning commissar than a responsive, public-oriented commission in the world's greatest democracy. A 20 mile EPZ under local and state authority would dispel such fears.

Sincerely,

Marcia S. Odell

Marcia Odell, FIS, MBA, PhD

Malcolm J. Odell, Jr.

Malcolm J. Odell, Jr., MA, PhD

Malcolm Odell

Lt. Col. Malcolm Odell (USA Ret.)

Marjorie R. Odell

Marjorie R. Odell

DS10:

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

Acknowledged by card.