

50-352

# Pennsylvania Intergovernmental Council

P. O. BOX 1288 • HARRISBURG, PA. 17108 • (717) 783-3700

February 6, 1984

A. Schwencer, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 2  
Division of Licensing  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Schwencer:

Subject: Supplement No. 1 to the Draft Environmental Statement - Limerick  
Generating Station, Units 1 and 2

Pennsylvania's Single Point of Contact under Executive Order 12372  
(Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs) has received ten copies of  
Supplement No. 1 to the Draft Environmental Statement - Limerick Generating  
Station, Units 1 and 2. We forwarded a copy to the Pennsylvania Department of  
Environmental Resources for review and comment. Although we received no  
specific comments from this Department, they did forward comments they had  
received from the Pennsylvania Department of Health. These comments are  
enclosed for your information.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

*Barbara J. Gontz*

Barbara J. Gontz  
Project Coordinator  
Intergovernmental Review Process

BJG/klm

Enclosure

8402140150 840206  
PDR ADUCK 05000352  
D PDR

COOZ  
1/1  
Add: S. Acharya - AEB  
T. MO - RAB

(717) 787-1708

January 18, 1984

SUBJECT: EIS - Limerick Generating Station Units 1 and 2

TO: Department of Environmental Resources  
Bureau of Policy Analysis  
2nd Floor Fulton Bank Building

FROM: James N. Logue, Dr. P.H., M.P.H. JNL  
Director  
Division of Environmental Health

In our review, the Division focused attention on those portions of the document relating to possible health effects. The Division assumed that proper methodology was used in the evaluation of the environment, predictions of accidents, etc., discussed in other portions. The sections relating to health effects are very complex and some areas are not totally understandable (e.g. - Risk consideration). However, this Division, together with DOH's Division of Epidemiology Research, did review the document and offer the following statements:

1. Comparison of risks due to operation of the plant to risks due to other human daily activities suggests that the plant risks appear to be inconsequential.
2. Cancer risk, even in a "worst case" situation, appears acceptable. This judgement takes into consideration the fact that the chance of a severe case occurring is very remote.
3. As to safety, such as the evacuation scheme, we question how realistic this is.
4. Since the Emergency Preparedness Plan is not completed or included for this specific site, it is difficult to evaluate the response to any type of accident that may occur at Limerick. This plan, it is noted, is required before a license can be issued.
5. Basically we have no objections to the health effects, avoidance or impact sections of the document.

JNL:jew

cc: Dr. Hays  
Dr. Logue  
Dr. Fox  
file