

DOCKET NUMBER

PROPOSED RULE

PR-140(44FR43128) ²

RD 2

Biglerville, PA 17307

July 25, 1979

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



After reading NRC release 79-121 with attachment I wish to submit the following.

1. The first of the "two-pronged test for an ENO" points requiring substantial off-site radiation is in question because monitoring was grossly inadequate during the initial days of the March 28 "incident". In addition, the criteria for establishing radiation doses are criminally negligent in view of the effects of low-level radiation according to studies completed by Mancuso, Natarajan, Bertell and others (although pro-nuclear individuals, corporations and agencies discredit the studies, such attitudes do not demean the studies but rather the pro-nuclear entities themselves since those studies are clearly at least as credible as those now accepted by the nuclear industry).
2. The second part of the "two-pronged test for an ENO" requiring substantial off-site damage is morbidly laughable. How can latent cancer be proved within the statute of limitations period when latent cancer typically requires longer than the statute period to develop? Clinical evidence of injury from exposure within 30 days would require massive over-exposure - clearly overlooking any lesser exposure as worthy of no consideration. Again, this attitude reflects criminally negligent 1968 thinking and should have been corrected several times in the ensuing eleven years.
3. The NRC seems to have overlooked the hapless individuals whose job required them to be within the five-mile radius of TMI during the days following March 28. Medical examinations including the ridiculously primitive whole-body radiation scan were denied of anyone not residing in the immediate area. As a result, I and many others will have to bear the results of radiation exposure without assistance or compensation under guidelines presently familiar to me.

The NRC has set up a "Catch 22" situation in the purest Joseph Heller sense. In short, the Price-Anderson Act including the "waivers of defenses provisions" has the effect of protecting and promoting nuclear industry at the expense of the public whose lives and property, not to mention genetic pool, are jeopardized by the nuclear industry.

Sincerely,

Gene McCae Albright
Gene McCae Albright

Acknowledged by card. *8/10/79*

903001

POOR ORIGINAL

7909040465