



October 4, 1979

Secretary of the Commission
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attention: Docketing and Service Branch

Dear Secretary:

I herewith re-petition to intervene in the hearings relating to the proposed re-opening of T.M.I. Unit 1.

In response to the objections of Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge and the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board regarding distance I submit:

1. R.D. #5, Coatesville is approximately 48 miles from plant.
2. Radiation plumes pose potential hazard for great distances.
3. Plumes can cause physical damage to persons, animals and land located at R.D. #5, Coatesville.
4. Information regarding presence of plumes, etc., from plant accidents is inadequate at R.D. #5, Coatesville.
5. Hazards at this distance not acknowledged, and implicitly denied, therefore would not be substantially intervened by NRC, government and others.

Other distance-related factors:

1. Husband's business is at Intercourse (35 miles from plant), and son is employed there. They travel to and from Harrisburg airport.
2. Family has social attachments in Lancaster and Lebanon counties.
3. Family's food supply is from our farm and lands adjacent to plant.
4. Family's farm is situated 20 miles from reactors at Peach Bottom and 35 miles from Salem. Proposed reactors would be the following distances: 20 miles to Limerick, 20 miles to Fulton and 60 miles to Berwick. The plant at T.M.I. is part of this total environment.
5. Deposition of wastes by way of public roads denies validity of distance; also possible burial and choice of site within Pennsylvania.

1177 264

7910180 847 G

Regarding cost:

1. Upgrading safety of nuclear reactors will increase electric rates for all consumers in the Northeast grid.
2. Opening plant would influence course of nuclear construction, including Limerick and Fulton.
3. Opening plant would mandate further costly studies and programs.
4. Disposition of wastes, transporting and guarding are costs that would be passed to consumer, and possibly, taxpayer.

Regarding request for specific aspects and personal issues:

1. I removed my family for two weeks at considerable expense and inconvenience.
2. Emotional effects on my sons, daughter, mother, cub scout troop, neighbors, myself and others was real and lasting.
 - a. Many studies causally link stress and disease.
 - (1) Possibility of meltdown was a valid stress
 - (2) Other stresses - emissions, unknown
3. Persons who perceived our farm as a desirable source of food no longer do.
4. Present consideration to reestablish our farm in dairying is threatened.
5. Sixteen years investment in conservative farming to improve land and health has been reduced in value and would be further damaged.
6. Two aunts lived unknowingly for approximately 30 years near a government-owned radiation dump. Both died of rare cancers within the past three years.
7. Rural areas are targets for dumping sites.
8. Isotope levels in our cattle are a concern.
9. Abandonment of our property, animals and personal valuables, was stressful.
10. Stress of domestic animals resulted in loss of one life, and loss of all of our chickens.
11. In advent of a catastrophic accident, our land, valuables, animals would be destroyed, and would not be compensated for under present coverage.
12. The above has not been demonstrated to be a primary concern of Met-Ed, nor one for which they have demonstrated ability to compensate.
13. "Chance-taking" with government approval reduces quality of life.
 - a. Rasmussen study assures possibility of catastrophic accident.
 - b. Land-use programs to preserve farmland supported as a farm-association member appear to be folly.

Sincerely,

Marjorie M. Aamodt
Marjorie M. Aamodt

R.D. #5, Coatesville, Pa. 19320

1177 265