

POOR ORIGINAL

DOCKET NUMBER

PROD. & UTIL. ENG.

50-466

September 12, 1979

SERVED

SEP 18 1979

Stephen M. Sohinki
Counsel for N. R. C. Staff
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555
Docket 50-466



Dear Sir:

I would like to state below my contentions against the licensing of the Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station.

I contend that the present site is unsuitable for the placement of a nuclear power plant--No. 1. It would seem to me with the great growing population taking place along Interstate 10, Highway 1093, Highway 359, and ofcourse the Richmond-Rosenberg Area--locating the Allens Creek Nuclear Plant at Wallis is a bad idea. Even by your own estimates there will be 4,530,000 people living within 50 miles of the plant--surely there is a better less populated area available! Residential area's in Houston are spreading West at a very fast perhaps surprising pace. In the 1970 census, the Richmond-Rosenberg Area had a population of 17,335 while today the Rosenberg Chamber of Commerce estimates that there are 27,000 persons in the city. The Area Council of Houston estimates Ft. Bend County will have 280,498 people by the year 2000. Your November 1978 Final Environmental Statement listed 145,000 in the 0-20miles from site for the year 2000. Your figure for the year 2020 in the 0-20 miles area from site was 202,000. It seems to me that there is justification to totally reevaluate the feasibility of the present site.

I contend that the present location of the Bay City Nuclear Site is the proper place to put one additional 1200MW nuclear plant reactor if one more is to be built. The area has already become an industrial location of sorts; the area around Wallis has not and is mainly residential, ranching and agriculture. This choice of locations does more to preserve the overall environment by containing nuclear development. Using the present location at Bay City would free the vast acreage in Wallis held by H. L. & P. for more acceptable use also being better for the environment. The population density in Matagorda county is estimated to be 53,497 in the year 2000 by the Area Council of Houston contrasted with Ft. Bend estimating 280,498. The cooling lake at the Bay City site could handle this additional reactor and spare the Brazos of further depletion. Good drinking water is a valued commodity in the Houston area and this should be given full value. (Contention N. 2)

I contend that as yet this country has no safe disposal site for high-level radioactive materials and having according to the Texas Energy Advisory Council (Volume 4, Number 57, August 3, 1979) tens of millions of gallons of high-level waste already stored on government reservations such as Richland, Washington and

7910220 452

Aiken, South Caroling--there should be no more permits issued until this matter is resolved. It seems from the various news media reports that the temporary facilities are plagued by leaks which conceivably endanger the local citizens. I contend that this permit be denied because of the complete lack of permanent storage locations. (Contention No. 3)

I contend with more emphasis on conservation it is possible to do without nuclear power as an energy source. It should be regarded as the energy of last resort. The N. R. C. should promote tax breaks for consumer insulation, higher utility rates for commercial users (this has the additional benefit of encouraging them to become energy independent, peak hour rates, inter-connected pipelines between H. L. & P. and other utility systems and consumer education whenever possible. (Contention N. 4)

radiation
I contend that low-level/usually dismissed by so many nuclear proponents as of little or no concern is possibly quite a serious health hazard. I favor a ban on the licensing of new nuclear plants until a consensus can be reached among our available supply of experts on the subject. The BIER report concluded that a consensus was not available at this time. (Texas Energy Advisory Council Volume 4, Number 57, August 3, 1979) (Contention No. 5)

I contend that solar energy is much preferred and should be given full support. Solar energy deserves to share a greater portion of the research money made available for energy. Contention No. 6)

Sincerely,

Rosemary N. Lemmer

Rosemary N. Lemmer
11423 Oak Spring
Houston, Texas 77043

POOR ORIGINAL