



790904
Louise E. Watson
RD 2 Box 59
Union Dale, Pa
17470

CF

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Washington, D. C. 20555

CF

DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-387,388

Dear Sir:

I have just received the Final Draft Environmental Statement for the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station at Berwick. It appears that much research and work has gone into the preparation of this statement. As an interested and concerned citizen, living less than 30 miles from the plant, I have a few comments I would like to make.

There was quite a bit of data collected on fish and wildlife but there was none collected on humans - no health picture of the human population within 10 miles of the plant - before the start up of operation. I feel this should have been done - to have some comparison with data that might be taken a few years later, with respect to effects of radiation, etc, with normal operation of the plant and also in case of an accident such as at T.M.I.

We were informed, during a visit to the Berwick plant, that a reservoir is planned to be constructed across the river to make up for additional cooling water that will be needed, since the S.S.E.S. is restricted by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission.

Acknowledged by card. *9/14*

7910010614 A

in the context of ~~the~~ they can use from
the river. We object to the additional
destruction of habitat which would result.

On page G87, 6.2.2. in the Environmental
Statement of June 1973, the staff comments
"the applicant does not appear to have made
arrangements for interchange of data as yet,
with nearby radiological monitoring programs
at Peach Bottom, T.M.I., Dryden Creek, Indian Point,
Asharem, Forked River, Newbold Island, Dulan, or
Limerick. In the revised Draft Statement
of June 1979, this omission has not been
corrected."

In the section 4.5.5 on Uranium Fuel Cycle
Impacts, we object to the conclusion that
"both the dose commitment and health effects
of the uranium cycle are insignificant when
compared with dose commitment and potential
health effects to the U.S. population resulting
from all the natural background sources."
The effects are additive, and even the natural
background sources are considered responsible
for mutations, cancer, and other diseases, just
because we must tolerate natural background
sources, does not follow that radiation from
the uranium fuel cycle is harmless!
It could be the "straw that breaks the
camel's back."

Thank you for allowing us private citizens
to make comments.

Very truly yours,

Ronnie E. Watson

P.O. Box 59

Union Dale, Pa.

18470