


Secretary
Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, D.C. 20555



University of Montevallo
Montevallo, Al. 35115
July 16, 1976

Dear Sir,

I am writing in opposition to the re-licensing of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2--Docket No. 50-259 and 50-260. I wish my remarks be placed in the record for all commissioners to read.

The TVA has shown a disregard for the environment and re-licensing should be held up until there is a significant change in the attitude (and membership?) of the directors of the TVA. I think that the simplest argument against nuclear power plants is that the insurance companies will not insure them.

Also, we still do not know what to do with the radioactive wastes. I have little faith in the pronouncements of the "experts". A few years ago, they swore they found the perfect spot for a radioactive grave--a salt mine in Kansas, I believe. Yet amateur ecologists had little trouble proving that the site was not safe at all. Until some experts can prove that Dixie Ray Lee was wrong (when she said we may have to shoot the waste into space) I object to adding to the deadly pile. In most cases where the waste has been buried, dangerous leakage already exists.

Another reason for my opposition to the re-licensing is that the power is not really needed by the people of the area. I object to business moving to the TVA area because the TVA promises abundant power. Until we can check inflation and develop substitutes for certain ores that are being rapidly depleted, I am in favor of ZEG--zero economic growth. If we continue to grow as we have in the past, our grandchildren will have a lower standard of living than we do, because all of the cheap sources of almost everything we use will be used up. Extra power means extra growth. For what? More boats on crowded lakes? Three TV sets in every house? More cars to clutter up congested highways? (A 30% better gas mileage is no saving if there are 30% more cars on the road!)

We can no longer conduct our affairs without looking at the distant future. Creating problems with the hope that we can solve them in the future is no longer tolerable in a society where everything we do has so many different consequences. The NRC needs to be convinced that harmful results will not result from its decisions.

You may say that this is a tall and impossible order. But I don't. There is no "balancing" of interests--growth v. environment.

Acknowledged by card 7/20/76 *[Signature]*

Congress, in passing laws on air and water pollution, in passing laws on occupational safety, and in requiring environmental impact studies has made it quite clear that economic growth is secondary to other factors.

I do not contend that you need proof beyond a reasonable shadow of doubt, but you need enough proof to convince a prudent and reasonable man that no serious damage will be done. I contend that the TVA has not yet given this proof. And until it does, I doubt that any court would absolve the NRC of blame in event of disasters.

Sincerely,

Roy Lechtreck
Roy Lechtreck

