

Director,  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis,  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington D.C. 20555

Aug. 11, 1979

Dear Director,

I would like to comment on the draft environmental statement concerning the nuclear Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Luzern County, Pennsylvania.

The booklet you sent me was very impressive. However it was equally unreadable.

I feel that we here in Pennsylvania already have too many nuclear power plants, contributing more and more radioactivity to the air and the Susquehanna river through normal operations let alone accidents like TMI. It's been said that any dose of radiation is an overdose, so I can't see how this new plant will contribute anything to our health and safety here in Pennsylvania.

#5-1 ?  
RAB

Also considering the fact that the NRC as of now has no final plans for waste disposal, I don't feel that the on-site accumulation of these wastes will be beneficial to the residents of our state.

#5-2  
ETSB

I strongly disapprove the issuance of any license to operate the Susquehanna plant until you have:

- a way to dispose the wastes safely
- can operate the plant without adding more low level radioactivity to our environment

#5-3  
ETSB

-can be sure through independent studies that the effects of low level radiation emitted from the plant over the 30 to 40 year life span will not harm the public.

#5-4  
RAB

Sincerely,

*Michael L. Henshey*

Michael L. Henshey  
626 E. Pine St.  
Lancaster, Pa. 17603

002  
170

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 58-387,388



August 30, 1979

424 Laurel Drive  
Hershey, PA 17033

Mr. Joseph M. Hendrie  
Chairman  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Hendrie:

I note with much apprehension, that the NRC has recommended licensing of the Berwick Nuclear Plant on the Susquehanna River. You reassure us that "no significant environmental impacts are anticipated from normal operational releases of radioactive materials."

28-1  
RAB

I find this statement to be both arrogant and misleading to the public. First, please define for me what "significant" means. Any low level radiation releases are significant as has been admitted and proven, even by the old AEC and the NRC's own studies. There is no safe level of radiation exposure. How can you say then that releases are of "no significance?"

Secondly, you "anticipate" no environmental impacts. May I remind you that Three Mile Island was not "anticipated" or planned for either. Where man is involved, there will never be a safe nuclear power plant. The nuclear way is an unforgiving way. Once the unanticipated happens, it stays with us for generations.

Thirdly, it is time to tell the public the truth regarding the "normal operational releases" from nuclear plants. How much "normal" radiation will be or is projected to be released by the Berwick plant, how much "normal" radiation is currently being released by the operating plants in this country, and who sets these, and how are these "normal" release ceiling levels set?

The current standards were initially set in order to justify atomic bomb testing. Those standards were kept in order to justify nuclear power plants because the nuclear industry and our government recognizes that no plant operates without "normal" releases of radiation.

Recognizing that the AEC, NRC, and other scientific studies have proven that there is no safe level of radiation exposure, negates the "normal" release standards currently used. Normal may be normal for a nuclear plant, but not for a clean environment and certainly not for the health and safety of the public.

Mr. Joseph M. Hendrie  
August 30, 1979  
Page 2

Moreover, the boiling reactor cores at the Berwick plant are untried and unproven as to their overall safety and functioning. It does not matter how remote an accident of any kind may be, a chance is still there, especially with a new design. It only takes one accident to release dangerous radiation. The safety equipment and men at the Berwick plant are untried and unproven just as they were at TMI.

28-2-104  
Friedman  
10/13  
Lastly, let us use honest, straightforward language and tell the truth. "The temporary loss of habitat may have significant adverse impacts on the aquatic community in the vicinity of the site," really means that it would kill all fish and wildlife currently living near the site.

28-3-104  
10/13  
In summary, the Berwick plant is another threat to the Susquehanna River Valley, an added burden and danger not needed by the people of Central Pennsylvania. The plant as a nuclear facility, should not be licensed and operated. It is not safe to the normal environment of the people in Central Pennsylvania.

28-4-104  
10/13  
It is incumbent on the NRC in its charge "to protect the health and safety of the public" to tell us the truth about the Berwick plant and the other nuclear power plants. Please inform me in whatever scientific or non-scientific terms you wish:

1. What is your definition of significant, and how was it arrived at?
2. On what basis do you calculate the "anticipated" occurrences?  
The Rasmussen Report has already been proven to be incorrect.
3. How do you define "normal"? Normal operational levels of radiation emission are quite different and separate from normal background levels of radiation already existing in the environment. Also, because of bomb testing and power plants the "normal" levels of background radiation have increased over the past 30 years.
4. What individuals, by name, set these "normal" levels?
5. How much "normal" radiation will be expected to be released in Berwick?
6. What are the NRC's recorded, documented levels of "normal" radiation releases from the operating plants in the United States?



Mr. Joseph M. Hendrie  
August 30, 1979  
Page 3

Thank you for your anticipated prompt response to the above.

Sincerely,



Warren L. Prelesnik

cc: Richard T. Kennedy, Commissioner .  
John F. Ahearne, Commissioner  
Peter A. Bradford, Commissioner  
Victor Gilinsky, Commissioner  
Richard S. Schweiker  
H. John Heinz, III  
Allen E. Ertel  
George W. Gekas  
Rudolph Dininni  
Stephen R. Reed  
Pennsylvania Power & Light