

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 11/10/05

EDO CONTROL: G20050700

DOC DT: 09/29/05

FINAL REPLY:

Henry F. Bedford
Stratham, New Hampshire

TO:

Chairman Diaz

FOR SIGNATURE OF :

** GRN **

CRC NO: 05-0500

Zimmerman, NSIR

DESC:

ROUTING:

Emergency Plans for Seabrook

Reyes
Virgilio
Kane
Silber
Dean
Cyr/Burns
Collins, RI

DATE: 10/13/05

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NSIR

Zimmerman

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

Template: SEC4-017

E-RIDS: SEC4-01

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Oct 12, 2005 14:28

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-05-0500

LOGGING DATE: 10/11/2005

ACTION OFFICE: EDO

AUTHOR: Henry Bedford

AFFILIATION: NH

ADDRESSEE: Nils Diaz

SUBJECT: Emergency plans for Seabrook

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION: Chairman, Comrs

LETTER DATE: 09/29/2005

ACKNOWLEDGED No

SPECIAL HANDLING:

NOTES:

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE:

DATE SIGNED:

EDO --G20050700

HENRY F. BEDFORD
3 PENINSULA DRIVE
STRATHAM, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03885

29 September 2005

Nils J. Diaz
Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555

Dear Chairman Diaz:

When emergency plans for Seabrook Station were under review by the licensing board, educators, police officers, and other public officials testified that they would seek their own safety and that of their families before performing duties assigned in emergency plans. The board, on the basis of NRC rulings, ignored that testimony and ruled that public employees would follow the approved plan.

The response to emergencies caused by recent hurricanes suggests that this NRC dictum is contrary to fact. At least fifteen percent of New Orleans police officers apparently failed to meet assigned responsibilities. More than two hundred members of the National Guard reportedly declined to repair levees out of concern for personal safety. There are anecdotal instances of actions by medical personnel and public officials that resulted in the collapse of aspects of emergency plans.

In the light of this experience, ought not the NRC to revisit its assumption that emergency plans will be followed whatever the hazard to those asked to carry them out? When individuals have sworn in advance, as was the case at Seabrook, that they will not do what some planner says is their duty, has the NRC met its responsibility to protect the health and safety of the public when that testimony is disregarded? Emergency plans tend to rely on dubious assumptions, but when they depend upon those that are manifestly contrary to experience, is it not time to reexamine them and modify policies that depend on them?

Sincerely yours,

