

8005090442

H

May 6, 1980

4327 Alconbury Lane #3  
Houston, Tex. 77021  
(713) 741-4437

EMI Support Staff (or Responsible Officials)  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington D. C. 20555

Re: COMMENT ON NUREG-0662, "ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR  
DECONTAMINATION OF THE THREE MILE ISLAND UNIT 2 REACTOR  
BUILDING ATMOSPHERE.

To whom it may concern:

This "Draft Report" does not consider the feasibility of using plans #2 through #5 with plan #1 (Reactor Building Purge) as a standby.

In regard to such plans, it appears the Staff does not weigh heavily the importance of the fact many members of the public simply do not accept the idea that the releases are harmless. With that in mind, it is important that any of the alternatives except "Reactor Building Purge" be started. One has the feeling the public is asserting it does not want any more burden regardless of the dose of radioactivity.

In that situation for a government agency to make the choice and have General Public Utilities proceed with the "Reactor Building Purge" makes it in opposition to the people it "serves". It makes no difference if you can prove there will be no "harm" to the public by doing the building purge. The result can only be further animosity for the NRC and the utility.

Therefore, the "Reactor Building Purge" shouldn't be a plan, but rather the back-up to any other plan among the four listed from page 6-9 to 6-38 of the document.

I believe NUREG-0662 might expand on the options and problems involved if the last monitoring is lost between the EMI-2 reactor and the control room. Would it mean an effort would have to be made at once to enter the building?

But, going back to my original point. Since no preparation is needed to perform the "Reactor Building Purge" it is superior to make a try at another arrangement in order to avoid doing some action the public is clearly opposed to.

Sincerely,

*John F. Doherty*  
John F. Doherty

D019  
SE  
1/0