



Lorine C. Watson  
RD 2 Box 59  
Union Dale, Pa  
18470

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
Washington, D. C. 20555

DOCKET NUMBER

PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-387,388

Dear Sir:

I have just received the Final Draft Environmental Statement for the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station at Berwick. It appears that much research and work has gone into the preparation of this statement. As an interested and concerned citizen living less than 30 miles from the plant, I have a few comments I would like to make.

There was quite a bit of data collected on fish and wildlife but there was none collected on humans - no health picture of the human population within 10 miles of the plant before the start up of operation. I feel this should have been done - to have some comparison with data that might be taken a few years later, with respect to effects of radiation, etc., with normal operation of the plant and also in case of an accident such as at T.M.I.

We were informed, during a visit to the Berwick plant, that a reservoir is planned to be constructed across the river to make up for additional cooling water that will be needed, since the S.S.E.S. is restricted by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission.

Acknowledged by card. 9/14/79

in the amount of water they can use from the river. We object to the additional destruction of habitat which would result.

On page G87, b.2.2. in the Environmental Statement of June 1973, the staff comments "the applicant does not appear to have made arrangements for interchange of data as yet, with nearby radiological monitoring programs at Pensacola, T.M. In, Ogyster Creek, Indian Point, Shoreham, Forked River, New Bedford, Sella, or Lemovick. In the revised Draft Statement of June 1979, this omission has not been corrected.

In the section 4.5.5 on Uranium Fuel Cycle Impacts, we object to the conclusion that "both the dose commitment and health effects of the uranium cycle are insignificant when compared with dose commitment and potential health effects to the U.S. population resulting from all the natural background sources."

The effects are additive, and even the natural background sources are considered responsible for mutations, cancer, and other diseases. Just because we must tolerate natural background sources, does not follow that radiation from the uranium fuel cycle is harmless! It could be the "straw that breaks the camel's back."

Thank you for allowing us private citizens to make comments.

Very truly yours,  
Donna E. Watson

P.D. 2 B.7.59

Donna E. Watson, P.O.  
18470