

July 22, 1981

4327 Alconbury Lane #3
Houston, Tx. 77021

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

RE: COMMENT ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT RELATED TO
THE OPERATION OF GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 and 2.

To whom it may concern:

John F. Doherty, of Houston, Texas comments as below to
the Staff's Statement (NUREG-0777).

1. The statement on page 5-23 of the Draft: "This kind of accident cannot occur in a reactor like Grand Gulf, however, because of its water-cooled design" is vague. It certainly cannot be staff's position that fuel overheating and radioiodine and noble gas release cannot occur in the plant.
2. On page 5-24 of the Draft, how will traffic on Waterloo Road be controlled in an accident situation?
3. The statement on page 2-3 of the Draft (Page 2-3) is objectionable and reminiscent of the promotional days of the AEC. The sentence, "Regardless of the relative economics of nuclear energy versus energy from other sources, it is to the advantage of a public utility to have diverse sources of power available.", opens up great misgivings with regard to need for power issues. The statement appears to excuse the fact that the utility combine for Grand Gulf has overestimated its need for power. (See Sec. 2.4 on Page 2-4) This is because it simply says any additional power is good. With nuclear power plant costs up to \$1,200 per kilowatt, the amount of investment required for plants such as Grand Gulf (arguably) takes much capital away from other development of the region. Mississippi is known to have the lowest per capita income of the 50 states. Hence, Section 2.3 should be eliminated for these reasons and also because it is not within the bounds of NEPA requirements.

Thank You,

John F. Doherty, J. D.

8108050172 810722
PDR ADOCK 05000416
D PDR

C002
S1/0

