

MEMO FROM
J. LEDERBERG
GENETICS DEPARTMENT
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

TO:
Mr. Carl
Lloyd Harbor Study
Group

TX
RC
RO

AUG 25 1970

If there is any unrebutted suspicion that nuclear energy development on L.I. would lead to the exposure of a large population to as much as 10% of the FRC guidelines I would begin to share your alarm. What is your worst case estimate of the rem-equivalent exposure?

My "strong statement" was an attempt to be objective, which is not easy in this field. It does reduce, ~~at equilibrium (which would require at least 1) generations of exposure)~~ to \$10B/200 M pop./100 mrad/year or a per capita health cost of

Diagnostic- ^{1000 per rad. #500 per rad (germline exposure)}
Medical X-ray, as now used, just about survives a cost-benefit analysis on this basis.

The calculation assumes that our total true health bill is about 1/4 our GNP, which I believe but some would criticize; and that mutations account for 1/2 our health problem, which is reasonable. I would guess that the correct value that I give at \$500 lies in the range of \$100 to \$1000. You might want to expand on these numbers for a cost-benefit analysis of nuclear power; keeping in mind the costs of alternatives.

I do not suggest that the burden of proof be shifted from its proper seat -- the sponsors of these projects.