

February 18, 1989

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

Dear Chairman,

I am writting to you as a concerned citizen from Duxbury, Massachusetts regarding the state of emergency preparedness in the towns around Pilgrim, and your personal role and your agency's role in restart.

The Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant is going through the process of restart. A fact my home radiation monitor has been recording. Local emergency procedures have not been completed, testing of such plans has not occured, and reception centers are not ready to perform their jobs. Yet, you and your agency have somehow decided that this area is ready to deal with a radiological emergency.

What about Taunton? I question how the NRC could have accepted testimony from Boston Edison and from your own staff about the readiness of the reception center. For example: the building at Taunton was not cleaned until January 28 and 29, 1989; the portal monitors did not arrive until January 10, 1989 and are not yet properly positioned and tied in; the portable decontamination unit did not arrive until January 26, 1989 and is not yet connected to the plumbing. On what basis, then, did you allow Boston Edisons' testimony in October 1988 that the Taunton Reception Center was ready to perform its' job? State and local officials also appraised you off the situation at that time. How could a reasonable man now not challenge the very idea of 8,000 to 10,000 people going to Taunton to be monitored and perhaps "cleaned" in a single trailer which, incidentally, is not handicapped accessible? Yet, the plant went on line December 1988.

What about Bridgewater? Officials at Bridgewater State College are quoted in the press as saying they have serious reservations that the center could ever handle 7,500 evacuees. The Board of Trustees at Bridgewater are scheduled to discuss the matter on February 23, 1989. Right now, there is essentially nothing in place to serve as a reception center. Yet, the plant went on line December 1988.

What about Wellesley? The Public Works Barn remains just that-a barn. It will require millions of dollars worth of work before it can be used. Yet, the plant was allowed to restart December 1988.

The people in the impacted towns want a plan. We, in Duxbury, want a plan. We, in Duxbury, have been working very hard reviewing the proposals and making comment. We, in Duxbury, do not have a workable plan now. You know this.

The above mentioned deficiencies were called to your attention personally and to others in the NRC by letter, phone and at meetings by Alba Thompson Peter Agnes and Mary Dinan, to name but a few. With this knowledge, I feel you in encouraging restart and allowing its continuance are grossly negligent and acting well beyond the protection of your job. I am holding you personally responsible for knowingly acting solely in the interest of the nuclear industry and not in the interest of the public.

Mary Elizabeth Lampert
Mary Elizabeth Lampert
148 Washington Street
Duxbury Massachusetts 02332

8904240076 890417
PDR ADDCK 05000293
H PDC

CONTROL NUMBER: ED0 0004324
NRR RECEIVED: MARCH 15, 1989
ACTION: DREP: CONGEL

PLEASE NOTE THE ATTACHED GREEN TICKET IS FOR
APPROPRIATE ACTION. PLEASE REVIEW THIS ITEM
AND DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT YOUR DIVISION
WILL TAKE ACTION. IF ACTION IS GOING TO BE
TAKEN, WHAT IS AN APPROPRIATE DUE DATE?
RETURN ONLY THIS COMPLETED COVER SHEET TO THE
NRR MAILROOM, 12-G-18 BY 3/17/89.

NO ACTION NECESSARY

YES, ACTION

DUE DATE: 4/28/89

ROUTING: MURLEY/SNIEZEK
MIRAGLIA
CRUYCHFIELD
GILLESPIE
MOSSBURG
VARGA



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

APR 17 1989

Ms. Mary Elizabeth Lampert
148 Washington Street
Duxbury, Massachusetts 02332

Dear Ms. Lampert:

I am responding to your letter to Chairman Lando W. Zech, Jr. of February 18, 1989, in which you expressed your concern regarding the status of emergency preparedness for the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant.

As you are aware, after giving careful consideration to the views expressed on the emergency preparedness issue at both the October 14 and December 9 Commission meetings, the Commission voted unanimously on December 21, 1988, to endorse the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's proposal to permit the supervised restart of the Pilgrim facility. The decision was based on a thorough assessment of the management and technical issues, which were the original bases for the plant shutdown, as well as the status and progress toward resolution of the emergency planning issues.

The Commission's action did not result in the immediate resumption of full-power operations at Pilgrim. Rather, the Commission endorsed a deliberate, phased start-up program over a 4- to 6-month period, with augmented NRC oversight. Moreover, the Commission required the NRC staff to submit formal reports at each of six hold points. These reports were to include an assessment of progress made toward resolution of the Pilgrim emergency preparedness issues.

The Commission believed the supervised restart approach would provide the opportunity for the Commonwealth and local governments to make further progress on improvements in emergency planning while the NRC staff assessed the operating capability of the licensee. The start-up program has reached the 25 percent power level with NRC approval having been obtained at each hold point. The reports that the staff has prepared have included the status of emergency preparedness. The NRC staff evaluation of emergency preparedness issues indicates that progress has been made.

With respect to the issue of the reception centers, the NRC staff provided its assessment of this issue at both the October 14 and December 9, 1988, Commission meetings. Although proposed improvements to the reception centers had not yet been completed, the staff concluded that, if needed, the facilities could be used to carry out emergency response functions, including registration, monitoring, and decontamination of evacuees. In making its determination, the staff visited the Taunton and Bridgewater facilities, and considered the scope of the functions to be performed at reception centers, the existence of plans and procedures for the operation of the facilities, and the current availability or accessibility of equipment for use at the facilities in the event of an

~~89-0424005-7~~ 288

emergency at Pilgrim. In addition to NRC staff observations, information provided by the Civil Defense Director for Taunton indicates that the Taunton State Hospital could function adequately as a reception center during an emergency. The NRC staff concluded that, although improvements should be completed, the facilities and related planning for operation of the facilities are sufficient to ensure that the reception centers could be used effectively in the event of an emergency at Pilgrim. The Commonwealth's efforts to complete the reception center improvements, with the assistance of the Boston Edison Company, are expected to enhance the capability of these facilities to operate in an emergency.

To summarize, the Commission continues to endorse a deliberate, phased start-up program, over a 4- to 6-month period, with augmented NRC oversight. The NRC staff will continue to monitor both the operating performance of the licensee and the progress of the Commonwealth and local governments in improving offsite emergency preparedness. In this regard, the Commission strongly encourages cooperative and expeditious action by Boston Edison, the Commonwealth, and local governments to further improve the state of emergency preparedness for the area surrounding the Pilgrim facility.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Thomas E. Murley

Thomas E. Murley, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION:

TEMurley, NRR	WDTravers, NRR	DFMossburg, EDO-4324	Central Files
JHSniezek, NRR	RJBarrett, NRR	MCBridgers, EDO-4324	PEPB R/F
FJMiraglia, NRR	LJCunningham, NRR	CRC No: 89-0208	JPartlow, NRR
DMCrutchfield, NRR	CRVan Niel, NRR	JAWarren, NRR 89-28	
FPGillespie, NRR	FKantor, NRR	EDO R/F	
FJCongel, NRR	RTHogan, NRR	PDR	

PEPB/NRR
RTHogan:sc
4/11/89

SC/PEPB/NRR
FKantor
4/11/89

C/PEPB/NRR
WDTravers
4/11/89

D/DREP/NRR
FJCongel
4/11/89

4/13
4/2
AD/NRR
FJMiraglia
4/13/89

DD/NRR
JHSniezek
4/11/89

D/NRR
TEMurley
4/17/89

RTHogan

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]