PROD & UTIL FAC 50 300 (141 FR 48829)

NRC PUBLIC DOCUMENT ROOM

14 Kready Avenue Millersville, PA 17551 September 14, 1979

Secretary of the Commission Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Attn: Docketing and Service Branch

To Whom It May Concern:

I am opposed to the use of Epicor II at Three Mile Island to treat the intermediate level radioactive waste water.

Being scientifically oriented, I am surprised that the NRC is willing to use such a device, untested as it is, not knowing from previous experience what will happen. I am not willing, nor is my family, to be your guinea pigs.

Test it in the laboratory first -- you have no right to set up this system in the first place -- let alone use it, without previous experience. In light of all that has happened, when you supposedly KNOW what you are doing, Lord help us if you decide to use Epicor II.

In order to be proper about this matter, the NRC should do an environmental impact study -- not an environmental assessment (which your paper wasn't, by the way) ... it was simply a paper itemizing the proposed use of Epicor II.

The clean-up at Three Mile Island is likely to be more disastrous than the accident itself, and I am unwilling to be subjected to any more danger, both physical and psychological, than I already have over the past several months.

I urge you NOT to use this device. I recently heard Dr. Michio Kaku speak at Franklin and Marshall college -- he feels there are more acceptable ways of getting rid of the waste water -- though more costly and more time consuming.

It would seem to me that you are anxious for a quick clean up in order that TMI becomes operable again, within a short period of time.

Please consider investigating the other methods of clean-up -- pouring the water into concrete -- solidifying the waste -- or still other methods that can be devised.

Don't look for the cheapest and fastest way at the public expense.

Yours very truly,

Evelyn G. Epstein

scknowledged by card. 9 1

7910240475