

TERA

Records Facilities Branch (3)
016 Phil

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY,)
et al.)
[Three Mile Island Unit 1]) Docket No. 50-289
[Restart]

POOR ORIGINAL

Hershey, Pennsylvania

Place - Friday, November 16, 1979

1099 - 1285

Date - Pages

1379 032

Telephone:
(202) 347-3700

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001

NATIONWIDE COVERAGE - DAILY

7911210 466

T

CR 8061
11/16/79
RILEY/
WEINSHEL/
BEACH

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

jwb

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

----- x
:
In the Matter Of: :
:
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, : Docket No. 50-289
:
et al., : (Restart)
:
(Three Mile Island Unit 1) :
:
----- x

Hershey Little Theater,
14 East Chocolate Avenue,
Hershey, Pennsylvania,

Friday, November 16, 1979.

The special prehearing conference in the above-entitled matter was reconvened, pursuant to adjournment, at 9:20 a.m.

BEFORE:

IVAN W. SMITH, Chairman
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board.

DR. WALTER H. JORDAN, Member.

DR. LINDA W. LITTLE, Member.

On behalf of the Licensee, METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY:

GEORGE F. TROWBRIDGE, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
1800 M Street, Northwest
Washington, D. C.

1379 J33

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25

On behalf of the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power:

DR. JUDITH JOHNSRUD
433 Orlando Avenue
State College, Pennsylvania

On behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

WILLIAM PATON, ESQUIRE
LUCINDA SWARTZ, ESQUIRE
JAN NORRIS
Office of the Executive Legal Director
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C.

On behalf of the Consumer Advocate's Office:

MR. CULLEN
Office of Consumer's Advocate
Public Utility Commission
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

* * * *

ar

1101

C O N T E N T S

1		
2		
3	<u>Limited Appearance of:</u>	<u>Page:</u>
4	Joanne Topolski	1107
5	Mary Tritch	1110
6	Kathy Livingston	1114
7	Alice Frick	1114
8	Nancy Marter	1115
9	Dianne Musselman	1118
0	Henry H. Grinn	1120
1	Loretta Moore	1126
2	William Johnston	1128
3	John Murdoch	1131
4	Louise Dufour	1133
5	Barbara Herschkowitz	1140
6	Rhoda Carr	1141
7	Paula Kinney	1146
8	Sandra Cappell	1147
9	Carrie Light	1149
0	Edwina Coder	1156
1	Penny Johnston	1160
2	Jane Coby	1161
3	Dave Handley	1170
4	Marian Harlan	1184
5	Jerry Kissel	1194

1379 035

1	[Continued:]	
2	Al Manik	1198
3	Jack Lehman	1204
4	Jane Gray	1206
5	John J. Kovalic	1208
6	Brynn Schmitt	1212
7	Allen Kroehler	1214
8	Jean Ewing	1218
9	Beverly Hess	1221
10	Nancy Tate	1235
11	Susan Carty	1242
12	Steven Kraft	1243
13	Ed Tilson	1245
14	Mary Samuelson	1257
15	Scott Johnston	1261
16	Donna Christianson	1263
17	Dianne Staszewski	1265
18	Dennis McHugh	1270
19	Frances Rotunda	1276
20	Ron Borruso	1279
21	Rita Snyder	1283

22

23

24

25

POOR ORIGINAL

1379 036

Beach-Riley-1
Weinschel 2

Take #1
ar 101 3

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good morning, ladies and

gentlemen.

This is a continuation of the Special Session of the Prehearing Conference which has been convened for the purpose of receiving statements from the public.

As I'm sure everyone has noticed quite well by now, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has ordered the Unit No. 1 of the Three Mile Island Station to remain closed until this Atomic Safety & Licensing Board conducts a hearing and makes its initial decision and refers the matter to the Commission.

We are the Board that has been constituted for that purpose.

To my left is Dr. Linda Little, who is an environmental scientist, and is an adjunct associate professor of environmental biology at the University of North Carolina.

Dr. Little is also the president of her firm, L. W. Little Associates, who are consultants in environmental matters.

Dr. Little has been a member of our panel from which Atomic Safety & Licensing Boards are constituted since 1974.

To my right is Dr. Walter Jordan, who is retired as the Assistant Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and is a professor of nuclear

1 engineering at the University of Tennessee, and Dr. Jordan
2 has been a specialist in the field of nuclear safety for many
3 years, and has published and edited extensively on that subject.

4 My name is Iva Smith. I am an attorney, and I
5 serve as the Chairman of this Board, and that is my job. I
6 am a full-time Board Chairman for the Nuclear Regulatory
7 Commission.

8 The Commission has ordered that TMI-1 is to remain
9 shut down until we conduct a hearing in which we will determine
10 whether certain specified and -- rather unspecified short-term
11 actions should be taken, whether those short-term actions
12 are reasonable -- I mean necessary and sufficient, and once we
13 make a decision to that effect, then we must determine
14 whether certain other actions which are referred to as longer
15 term actions are necessary and sufficient, and whether the
16 Licensee, Metropolitan Edison Company, has made reasonable
17 progress toward those long-term actions.

18 These short or long-term actions are in most instances
19 technical considerations relating to, specifically to nuclear
20 reactors. Some of them relate to Babcock & Wilcox reactors,
21 most of them, which is the design of the Three Mile Island units,
22 and some of the actions which are anticipated relate to the
23 Three Mile Island facility in general.

24 Among the considerations we have to consider
25 aspects of reactor operator training, what effect the

1 decontamination or the restoration of Three Mile Island 2,
2 the damaged plant, may have upon the safe operation of Three
3 Mile Island 1.

4 We will inquire into Metropolitan Edison's
5 management capability to operate Three Mile Island 1, and
6 the financial qualifications to operate the unit safely.

7 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has also for
8 the first time in any proceeding has extended the opportunity
9 to advance reasons why issues of psychological stress resulting
10 from the possible operation of TMI-1 should not be considered
11 as an issue in this case, and that is a decision which will be
12 made by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission after the parties
13 to this proceeding, the Intervenor and other participants,
14 have fully briefed the subject and we have referred the matter
15 to the Commission. Then the Commission will decide whether
16 this Board can consider financial qualifications -- I mean
17 psychological distress issues.

18 The purpose of the limited appearance sessions is
19 essentially twofold:

20 One is for us to receive information from members
21 of the public who wish to make statements. Now the statements
22 from the public are not evidence; that is, we cannot take
23 a statement or a viewpoint and make a decision in this case
24 on that statement, because it simply is not evidence, and
25 this is an adjudicative proceeding.

1 But your statements can serve a very valuable
2 purpose, and that is -- well, the obvious, of course, is
3 they are reminders that we have an important job to do, but
4 also your statements can suggest areas where the evidence
5 should go, you know, where you might suggest an area that
6 hasn't been considered by anybody before, where there should
7 be some research, some studies, some analysis, and evidence
8 presented in the proceeding.

9 And, on the other hand, you can receive information.
10 You can suggest questions that either the Licensee or the Staff
11 should answer to you particularly, because of your particular
12 interest, and if you wish, you can inquire of the Board as to
13 how this proceeding is going to -- what's going to happen in
14 this proceeding.

15 Now, of course, we can't give you answers as to
16 our viewpoint on issues which have to be decided in the
17 proceeding, because that would be prejudgment, of course, and
18 we can't do that.

19 But if you have questions about how we operate and
20 what is going to happen in this proceeding, we would welcome
21 those questions.

22 We have asked persons to sign up in the order in
23 which they wish to appear, and we have -- now we have six
24 people. We announced in our notice that it may be necessary
25 to limit statements to five minutes. I don't think this

1 morning that it would be necessary to apply that rule
2 strictly, because I think the way things are going, we may
3 have plenty of time.

4 However, sometimes we've been fooled, too, and that
5 is more people come in later. So what I would recommend
6 that we might change our proceedings somewhat. If you intend
7 to occupy more than, substantially more than five minutes,
8 allow those who have shorter statements to go ahead.

9 May I have by a show of hands an indication of
10 people who have more or less statements which would occupy five
11 minutes?

12 [Show of hands.]

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. As a matter of fact, I
14 think everybody who signed up has indicated that, so we'll
15 just proceed as scheduled.

16 We will begin with -- well, the first is Tony
17 and Joanne Topolski. Either of you may proceed as you see fit.
18 The Topolskis will be followed by Mary Fritch, and then by
19 Kathy Livingston, and if you will be ready as one speaker
20 concludes, you will be ready to take your place at the podium,
21 it will be quite helpful. And there are chairs up there for
22 that purpose.

23 Ms. Topolski.

24 MS. TOPOLSKI: Shall I speak into the --

25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes. You want to stand close to

1 that microphone; otherwise, the people in the rear won't be
2 able to hear you very well.

3 MS. TOPOLSKI: All right.

4 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF MS. JOANNE
5 TOPOLSKI.

6 MS. TOPOLSKI: My name is Joanne Topolski, and I
7 am married and have three young sons, and I am here to express
8 our feelings on the reopening of TMI Unit 1.

9 We live four miles from the plant, and never
10 experienced such fear, anxiety and stress since the accident.
11 When we hear the news reports about Met Ed Unit 1 reopening,
12 the EPICOR system, the venting, or wanting to vent of the
13 krypton-85 into the atmosphere, we feel our insides just
14 turning.

15 We still are suffering the psychological stress
16 created by the March 28th accident. Concern for safety of
17 the past record of Unit 1, there have been eight unplanned
18 radioactive releases from November of 1974 to November of 1975,
19 and 15 other safety incidents at Unit 1 up to May 23rd of 1977,
20 operated by Met Ed. A total of 23 safety incidents, all
21 documented and compiled by the Nuclear Safety Information
22 Center, Volume 1618, Docket No. 50-289, all of which our
23 family was unaware of during this time.

24 There is a question of disposal sites for nuclear
25 waste. Where will they store the waste from Unit 1? We

1 certainly don't want the added danger of the storing of
2 radioactive wastes on the island.

3 Reading an article from a magazine, Field & Stream,
4 December of 1979, this issue, the incident in January of 1961,
5 when a power excursion lasting 1/500th of a second at the
6 SL-1 Atomic Reactor at Idaho Falls, Idaho, instantly killed
7 three technicians. Their hands and heads which were devoid of
8 any kind of covering, were so severely irradiated with nuclear
9 contaminants that these appendages had to be severed from their
10 bodies and stored with other high level radioactive wastes.

11 These human remains are still hazardous to the
12 health and well being of any living creature coming in contact
13 with them, that they will have to be stored and monitored
14 for thousands of years.

15 The Idaho workers' heads and hands are not
16 scheduled for exhumation until about the year 10,000, if
17 civilization and earth still exist at that point.

18 You cannot see, feel, taste, or smell if there is
19 radiation around you. Everything looks normal when you return.
20 You cannot see the danger. Only an instrument can detect
21 the presence of radiation which we have none.

22 We should not be exposed any more to low level
23 radiation or unplanned releases which could be given off by
24 Unit 1 if reopened.

25 And what about 15 or so years from now? Reactors

1 only have a lifetime of 20 to 25 years when they become so
2 radioactive they are decommissioned and have to build new ones.
3 There is only one solution: to shut down Unit 1 permanently
4 and seal Unit 2, because we can't take any more mental and
5 emotional anguish from TMI.

6 [Applause.]

7 We just built --- we had just built a new house last
8 year and we are trying to sell our house since June and cannot
9 sell it. We will be forced to move, regardless, if Unit 1 is
10 reopened or krypton gas vented.

11 Our life savings are tied up with this house, and
12 who will compensate us? We say shut it down permanently.

13 Thank you.

14 [Applause.]

15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Topolski?

16 Oh, excuse me. Tony Topolski?

17 MS. TOPOLSKI: My husband had to work today.

18 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I see.

19 Mary Fritch.

20 MS. TRITCH: Tritch. Would you pronounce that,
21 please.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, I see. I'm sorry. Tritch.

23 MS. TRITCH: A lot of people pronounce it as Fritch.
24 It's really Tritch.

25

1379 J44

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF MARY TRITCH.

MS. TRITCH: And I'm from Londonderry Township. It's a separate municipality from Middletown, so I want you to be informed that it is Londonderry Township.

Okay. I do not want the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant to reopen on the basis of psychological contentions. I am so angry that Metropolitan Edison can get away with false advertising. They are saying there were no deaths from the March 28th accident.

Do you realize there were deaths in evacuation? Do you realize the life of a little two year old boy was snuffed out in an automobile accident during the evacuation?

Do you realize it is very difficult to move old people out of nursing homes without causing deaths? Ask the officials of the Odd Fellows Home in Frey Village in Middletown how many died as a result of evacuation.

Please be truthful.

Do you know that right now a government official is campaigning for the presidency, advocating use of heavy nuclear energy, with a contention that no deaths occurred due to the accident at Three Mile Island?

His false contention is no doubt due to your faulty advertising.

I am angry because although you have not mentioned Londonderry Township or your host community -- although you

1 have mentioned Londonderry Township as your host community,
2 you have not treated us as a viable, populated community.

3 From now on, please advertise that our population
4 consists of over 6000 people, some living very near the nuclear
5 plant.

6 You are giving the impression that Three Mile
7 Island is located in the middle of nowhere, and that is just
8 how you are treating Londonderry Township.

9 Never mind that you have not contributed that
10 much to the community. I believe that my community could
11 work for a better community without your million-dollar industry.

12 Forget the fact that our lands and property -- our
13 land and houses, lost property value, and that in the event
14 if our land was contaminated with radioactivity, you could not
15 replace it.

16 But please, please be more concerned with our
17 safety, in the event of evacuation, partial or complete. You
18 have not kept us cognizant of what you are venting, of what
19 harmful pollutants you are venting into the air, and given us
20 the time to take the proper safety precautions.

21 Be that as it may, do you realize that a snowstorm
22 could knock out communication by telephone and other media?
23 My family, for example, was without power for one week in
24 the aftermath of a snowstorm, until power was restored.

25 Have you planned for that kind of a contingency?

1 By that I mean if it's necessary to evacuate in a severe storm,
2 could you get all the roads cleared in time to save the people?

3 I am so angry that we have to live in fear for our
4 children and our grandchildren, that they are affected by the
5 air they breathe, the water they drink, and the food they eat,
6 which is grown on our land.

7 Any sickness they get will always be interpreted
8 not as a natural occurrence, but caused by the nuclear accident.

9 Can you afford to terrorize us further by reopening
10 TMI-1?

11 I am so angry that you use excuse we need energy
12 ahead of the safety of the population surrounding Three Mile
13 Island

14 I am angry that you care so little for us that
15 you cannot use an alternate fuel. For example, coal or hydro-
16 electric power.

17 I have never belonged to an anti-nuclear group before
18 the accident, but I do now. You have forced me to do so.

19 I represent just one of the many angry people in Londonderry
20 Township, because their anger cannot express how frustrated
21 and helpless they feel. You deceive yourself if you think the
22 silent majority are pro-nuclear. The silent majority is a
23 suffering majority, and you have caused them to be so.

24 I am angry that it is necessary for me to have to
25 come here to tell you what you should already know. You

1 should well be aware of the dangers of radiation and what it
2 can do to a community.

3 Why do I have to tell you? As a result, you have
4 shaken my faith in your industry and in my government. I
5 have always believed that our country is basically a
6 compassionate, caring country.

7 If you open TMI-1, you will have destroyed that
8 image of my country.

9 You can have a copy of my --

10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Tritch, is it your impression
11 that we are employees of Metropolitan Edison Company? It's
12 not facetious, but I just -- as you went through the -- do
13 you realize that we are the United States government, judicial
14 officers?

15 MS. TRITCH: I'm sorry if I gave that impression.

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, I just didn't know if you
17 knew. I mean I'm not raising the question. I just didn't
18 think that that point had been made clear to you.

19 MS. TRITCH: All right. Thank you.

20 Would you like a copy?

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is that a copy of your remarks?

22 MS. TRITCH: It's very rough.

23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.

24 end 1

25

1379 048

lrw2-1

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Kathy Livingston.

LIMITED APPEARANCE OF KATHY LIVINGSTON

MS. LIVINGSTON: My name is Kathy Livingston. I live in Newberry Township, which is six miles from the plant. At the time of the accident, I was pregnant with him and the whole situation was terribly upsetting.

We had to pack up everything, go, wonder where we should go in order to stay close to a hospital, close to the doctors. I think the worst part of it was not really knowing who to believe. There were so many conflicting reports as to the seriousness of the accident, if it was advisable to leave, if it was better to stay, and I think that, without question, this was probably the most devastating thing that ever happened to me in my life.

I am definitely opposed to opening TMI 1 because I feel that there are not sufficient safeguards for the health and safety of all the people in the area and I would like my child to grow up in a world that is safe for him.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mrs. Livingston.

Alice Frick.

LIMITED APPEARANCE OF ALICE FRICK

MS. FRICK: My name is Alice Frick. I live in York City. I would like to address the Board and find out why there are never any hearings in York County.

POOR ORIGINAL

1115

lrw2-2

1 We are affected by this situation. We are forced to
2 drive long distances to testify, which means that you aren't
3 going to hear from a lot of us, and York City is without the
4 ten mile radius but we get the wind and there is no control
5 over that. You don't take into account that there are a lot of
6 people there and they have no way of knowing whether they are
7 safe or not.

8 We are supposed to have the right to life, liberty
9 and the pursuit of happiness, and I think that nuclear power
10 takes that away from us because we can't see it, we can't hear
11 it and we have no way of fighting it. We have to accept some-
12 body else's opinion of how it should be.

13 There are hundreds of thousands of us out there and
14 we need you to take care of us because we can't do anything
15 about it. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

17 I have Ms. Nancy Marter next.

18 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF NANCY MARTER

19 MS. MARTER: My name is Nancy Marter and I live in
20 Lemoyne now, which is about twelve miles from TMI. I lived
21 three miles from TMI at the time of the accident.

22 I would like to tell you, from a personal viewpoint,
23 what it is like to live through a nuclear accident. We didn't
24 sell our home, either. There are nine homes for sale on our
25 street. Fortunately for us, we were able to get out of there

1379 050

lrw2-3

1 but there are a lot of people who can't. There are a lot of
2 people there who have very deep roots and don't want to get out
3 of there.

4 Fortunately, that wasn't our situation. Since we
5 moved to Lenoyns, I can't say that I feel terribly safe but I
6 feel better than I did because every time I came home, I had
7 to look up and see those towers and have all of the new fears
8 come alive in me again of the things that had happened as a
9 result of March 28.

10 We moved to Middletown, unfortunately, about three
11 years ago and my little girl was about eight months old then.
12 Since we have lived there, I was pregnant again and I had a
13 little boy, who was seven months old at the time of the acci-
14 dent. I wonder a lot about these emissions we didn't know
15 about before the accident. I wonder if they affected Annie
16 when she was a baby, whether they affected me when I was preg-
17 nant with Frankie, and, most of all, whether they affected
18 those kids the day of the accident.

19 We left on Thursday and I will never forgive myself
20 for not leaving Wednesday night, which was my first instinct.
21 After the accident happened, we left and we went to my
22 mother's place. This was on Thursday. And on Friday morning,
23 my husband didn't want to go but he did go with us. He had
24 thought maybe at first I was over-reacting but he went along.
25 On Friday morning, I went out to pick up a couple of groceries

1379 051

POOR ORIGINAL

1117

lrw2-4

1 and I came back and he was totally shaken up. My mother was
2 all upset. They heard the news about the evacuation of the
3 mothers and small children. We realized then that it was a
4 real thing. Then, in the afternoon, they started talking about
5 meltdown.

6 I can't begin to describe to you what it feels like
7 to think that you may never be able to go back to your home
8 again, that you don't know where your friends are. I have
9 so many friends that live in this area and relatives and I
10 didn't know where they were. I didn't know if they left.
11 Some of them, I didn't know if I would ever be able to get in
12 touch with them again. I didn't know if they would be able to
13 get out in time.

14 It is a feeling no one can understand except the
15 other people that went thorough it like I did. I didn't want
16 to come back home afterwards. Ironically, because, as far as
17 I'm concerned, your home is a place where you feel secure,
18 where you are with your family, where you have refuge from the
19 outside world. If you can't feel safe in your home, then
20 what do you have if you can't even feel safe in a place with
21 your family?

22 We can't feel safe in our home. Nobody in Middle-
23 town can feel safe in their homes because we don't know what
24 will happen at any given time. Every time a fire alarm goes
25 off in the middle of the night, I and anybody else that lives

1379 052

lrw2-5

1 in that area gets nervous and wakes up tense and afraid. I
2 can't tell you how many nights I couldn't sleep at all. I
3 would wake up in a cold sweat thinking about one of my child-
4 ren having leukemia. Or myself. It occurred to me one night
5 that maybe it affected me, too. I was out jogging at 6:15 in
6 the morning because I was trying to take care of my health.
7 What an irony that is. I will never know what happened then,
8 how much radiation I got then.

9 Like the other woman mentioned, I belong to an anti-
10 nuclear group now. I never did before, either, although I
11 didn't advocate nuclear power. I belong to an anti-nuclear
12 group and I will do everything within my power to keep TMI 1
13 from opening again.

14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

15 Dianne Musselman.

16 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF DIANNE MUSSELMAN

17 MS. MUSSELMAN: Good morning. In March 1979, I was
18 five months pregnant. During the last four months of my preg-
19 nancy, my life was filled with anxiety and many sleepless
20 nights. These were not only caused by the uncomfortableness
21 of pregnancy, however, but from the turmoil of an event that
22 still causes sleepless nights. That is, a nuclear accident
23 which occurred only a few miles from my home.

24 On March 26, my husband and I moved from Cincinnati
25 to Lemoine and on March 30 we were on our way to North Carolina

POOR ORIGINAL

1119

lrw2-6

1 leaving the new home we just moved into. The experts suggested
2 only that I stay indoors because I was out of the ten mile
3 radius. I am glad I didn't follow their advice. How in God's
4 name could anyone accept advice of that nature which such a
5 vital force was on the verge of destroying lives for hundreds
6 of miles around.

7 My son is now three and a half months old. Thank
8 God, he is healthy. Then you may ask: Why is it that I still
9 can't sleep? Because I wonder if six or seven years from now
10 a mutation in a gene in his cells in his body could trigger
11 the road to his grave.

12 I want him to live to love someone some day, to love
13 himself, to live in a peaceful, fruitful world where he won't
14 have to worry about his children being destroyed in a war by a
15 nuclear bomb, much less by an accident in a nuclear power plant
16 while he stands by helpless.

17 Human beings cannot control, predict or contain
18 radiation. Why mess around with the stuff, then? Why? There
19 are people at stake. There are lives at stake.

20 Thank you.

21 1379 054
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

folo
LRW-2

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF HENRY H.
GRIMM, ANNVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Grimm?

MR. GRIMM: Representatives of the Nuclear
Regulatory Commission and the people in this audience:

I avail myself of this opportunity to speak to
attempt to summarize one important aspect of our energy
problems -- and I have been here for all three sessions so
far.

In effect, a large fraction of the intervenors
are attempting to vaguely specify the results expected from
our energy production processes. However, vaguely specifying
these expectations from our energy production processes is
not enough. These specifications must be reduced to a
definitive set of statements suitable for initiating a
bidding process. If we expect an energy supply, we must
negotiate with those who are willing to try to provide the
energy supply.

One way for the government to fulfill this
responsibility would be to formalize a procedure to get to
such a bidding process. I expect almost all of us want to
have a centrally electric -- or a centralized electric
production process.

As an aside, I note that it has always been
possible for me or any other person to go it alone and have

1 their own electric power plant. We citizens have an
2 obligation to the government to specify what kind of electric
3 power supply we want. Assuming it is centralized, some
4 vital questions need to be answered by intervenors.

5 What fraction of the time do you want electric
6 power to be available to you?

7 Shall the system be designed for one hour of
8 down time per year on the average? One day? One week?

9 How much electric power and energy do you think
10 should be available to every person at home, at work?

11 In the entire energy production process, what
12 objectives should we have in total accidental deaths per
13 year? What fraction of these deaths shall be among the
14 working people employed in the process? What fraction of
15 deaths shall be among the consuming people?

16 How should the plant be distributed geographically?

17 How long will this process be permitted to function
18 without serious disruption? 10 years? 20 years? 50 years?
19 Clearly, a set of specifications would take a lot more than
20 5 minutes, even its presentation.

21 The above will have to suffice as representative
22 material.

23 I think you, then, as the Nuclear Regulatory
24 Commission are faced with the option of having to assemble
25 answers to these sorts of questions from the intervenors, or

1 the entire populace if necessary.

2 Some governmental agency would have to reduce them
3 to a small group of processes to be presented as specifica-
4 tions to prospective suppliers. They would have to provide
5 their bid for the electrical energy production process in
6 prices per kilowatt hour to the consumer.

7 Government agencies would then have to select
8 those bids which are physically realizable and physically
9 credible. If we are going to be democratic about this, we
10 would then have to have a national or regional referendum
11 on which bid to accept.

12 At the end of this process, the government should
13 presume that it has a mandate to carry out the process using
14 military conscription and armed forces, if necessary. If
15 we cannot agree to accept the present processes working in
16 these directions -- and the NRC is one organization involved
17 in such an existing process -- we will have to get down to
18 the much more involved process, such as I have indicated
19 here.

20 Those people whose only participation is in
21 making physically unrealizable demands, as indicated by high
22 bids, or no bids, if you go through such a process, will have
23 to be made to back off. Some forms of intervention will
24 have to be declared illegal and criminal, such as shooting
25 out insulators on electric transmission lines is now.

1 I wrote this just this morning, and I listened
2 to a few of the comments here today. And let me say that I
3 continue to be an advocate of nuclear power, but this whole
4 process is putting me through a psychological trauma.

5 What I'm afraid of is the extreme sensitivity
6 of people to radiological death, as they picture it. What
7 would happen if we had a real serious emergency such as an
8 earthquake, or something like that? It sounds to me as
9 though we'd have complete chaos, because no one can accept
10 the risk of living in a world that has such things as
11 earthquakes.

12 One person mentioned Peter Beckman's book. I
13 hope you will all read that book. There are other risks
14 beside nuclear risk.

15 I would like to make a remark, too, about what
16 I have labeled the "zero risk syndrome." There are those
17 that keep saying that we must have a process that you can
18 tell me has zero risk. There is no zero risk process.

19 As a physicist I assert that it is almost a
20 certainty that there never will be a zero risk process.
21 The energy supply is part of our safety these days. We
22 have a mode of living that depends upon its continuing.
23 We must keep it in order and keep it working.

24 People say they don't have any access to you.
25 When we travel -- and I live 12 miles away; I only drove

3-5 JWB

1 6 to get -- I live 12 miles from TMI; I drove 6 to get
2 here. But I could write, so everyone has access to our
3 federal agencies. There's no such thing as having no access.
4 You can go to your representative and you'll probably get
5 much better access. But it is not true that there is no
6 access.

7 I have made a couple of moves since this all
8 began, but one of them began before this. I've been in
9 energy conservation for almost 10 years now as an avocation
10 and I have a solar hot water heater. I am about to purchase
11 a solar space heater, a dubious economic proposition. But
12 this activity of people has driven me to believe that I
13 cannot expect any consideration of the depression in my
14 savings. And I now can earn about \$4500 a year without
15 serious -- I'm over 65, so \$4500 a year is the maximum I
16 can earn and still not have practically all of it taken
17 away from me.

18 So the moves I have made are putting my money
19 where my mouth is. I am about to buy a solar space heating
20 unit which will cost me \$8000, and have invested \$2000 in
21 a solar hot water heater. I don't see any great rush of
22 people to buy solar equipment, although it has been available
23 for a long, long time.

24 So all this talk about conservation and so on
25 leaves me pretty cold. People do not react in a way to really

1379 359

1 conserve. They are just talking, not acting. So some of
2 these things that are happening are fears that people are
3 going to have to get used to. There is no way that we
4 can be supersensitized to radioactive risks or any other
5 risks. There are dozens of them.

6 People say that plutonium is the most toxic
7 substance available. Arsenic is more toxic, if you just
8 consider toxicity, than plutonium. You could be having
9 arsenic in your water all the time if some person were
10 intending to poison you. This was done in past years.

11 This fear of nonvisible risk, you can drive up
12 a hill and you don't know whether when you come to the top
13 of the hill whether there's somebody passing coming toward
14 you or not. That's an unseen risk.

15 There are many unseen risk in this world.
16 People who live below a hydroelectric dam are always under
17 risk. They can see that one, but it's there. Any sort
18 of sabotage could be used in many, many ways to put this
19 country in a very bad state, and Peter Beckman talks about
20 some of these things in the book.

21 Some of the people are so supersensitive to
22 radioactive risks had better read what a person like him
23 says about the other risks involved in our lives. It will
24 probably scare them to death, but they had better know
25 that they have those kinds of risks around them all the time

1 and there is no way you are going to get rid of them. They
2 are going to be with us forever.

3 I suppose I've taken 10 minutes, but this being
4 the end of the session, why I availed myself of that.

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Grimm.

6 MR. CRIMM: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Loretta Moore?

8 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF LORETTA MOORE,
9 MIDDLETOWN, PENNSYLVANIA.

10 MS. MOORE: My name is Loretta Moore. I live on
11 Plaine Street, Middletown. I would like to comment on
12 something Nancy Marter said. Our home was one of those
13 homes that was not sold when hers was up for sale.

14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can you hear her?

15 VOICES: No.

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: You will have to stand closer
17 to the microphone.

18 DR. JORDAN: And speak a little more loudly.

19 MS. MOORE: Okay. My name is Loretta Moore.
20 Now can you hear me?

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's good.

22 MS. MOORE: I live on Plaine Street in Middletown.
23 First I'd like to comment on something Nancy Marter said
24 before. Our home was up for sale at the same time theirs
25 was. Our home was not sold. We are still living there and

1 still in fear.

2 I would like to express my opposition to the
3 reopening of TMI Unit 2. As the mother of three young
4 children, I cannot help but worry about their future and
5 their children's future.

6 The problems of nuclear waste appear unsolvable.
7 Do you realize that if the ancient Babylonians had had
8 nuclear plants, we would still be keeping a check on their
9 waste today?

10 Government, science, and industry have no right
11 to play around with substances they do not understand. The
12 accident on March 28th was a traumatic experience to most
13 of the people living close by, and some continue to have
14 psychological problems.

15 However, I am more concerned about possible
16 cancer and leukemia 5 to 10 years from now affecting my
17 children and their friends and other children in the 5 to 10
18 mile radius and the genetic defects that might not be seen
19 for one or two generations. Our children do not deserve
20 this kind of legacy.

21 I would like to close by commenting on the
22 previous physicist. Earthquakes are not man-made, but these
23 nuclear plants are.

24 Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

1379 062

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Has anyone signed to make a
2 statement who we haven't come to yet?

3 Apparently we have four more.

4 Mr. Johnston?

5 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF WILLIAM JOHNSTON,
6 MIDDLETOWN, PENNSYLVANIA.

7 MR. JOHNSTON: My name is Bill Johnston. I live
8 four miles from the site of the nuclear plant, and I have
9 something in common with you people, too. I'm a retired
10 federal worker. I spent most of it in personnel work, or
11 it was not a matter of deciding on the issue but examining
12 it. So I'm in sympathy with you.

13 However -- and I'm glad there aren't too many
14 people here, because I'm no more than a high school
15 graduate. I'm no expert. And in a way this is an advantage,
16 because I've gone out of my way since the accident to learn
17 about these things. But I do want to say one thing.

18 I'm not here to alarm anyone, but we are dealing
19 with life and death. Now nothing could be more concise
20 than that. This is not over.

21 There are people with children here. I wish
22 there weren't. Because the radioactivity contained in that
23 containment building at the present time is enough to kill
24 us all, if it would get out accidentally.

25 Now one reason this cannot be filtered: Even

1379 063

1 though krypton is an inert gas, you cannot filter out stron-
2 tium 90, for one thing. But even aside from that, to filter
3 the radioactivity out under one method would take all of
4 the charcoal that is manufactured in one year in the United
5 States. It's an impossibility.

6 Now as much as I hate to say this, their plans
7 are to release a little bit of this over a period of time.
8 I wish they could find another way. I hope it doesn't get
9 out accidentally.

10 But now, hey, I have been here and listened to
11 all of this -- and you can stop me any time you like -- I
12 tried to testify before the Kemeny Commission and got
13 carried away, and the people that were taking the notes
14 didn't understand me; I didn't come out very well. But to
15 me, life is sweet. I'm in your age category. I hear
16 young people talking, and some of them are very -- I admire
17 them -- they're very brave. At one time I was braver than
18 I am now, but as I say life is sweet.

19 If I must die, maybe it is in an automobile
20 accident. This is true. However, this is a fact of life
21 that cannot be changed. Life and death cannot be changed.

22 However, if there's a possibility for me to avoid
23 a situation, hey, I don't think that God meant me to throw
24 myself on them and not do anything to help myself. Now
25 this is my situation. It just so happens -- and I hate to

1 say this because it puts me in a category different from
2 other poor people. I am in a situation to leave very
3 shortly. My wife also worked for the Federal Government.
4 She will be able to retire, and we could leave here with a
5 great financial loss -- and finances is neither here nor
6 there when you're talking about life and death -- but this
7 is not the situation. This is the United States of America.

8 Now, hey, I just can't help but think. A quota-
9 tion came to my mind here recently. This beautiful country,
10 central Pennsylvania, the green grass, the Susquehanna
11 River. It reminds me of -- I don't want to get melodramatic
12 here; I don't mean that -- but a quotation came to my mind
13 that would be very appropriate.

14 I think it was William Blake who said this. He
15 said, looking and seeing a great beauty, "Was Jerusalem
16 built here among these satanic mills?"

17 I mean, as I say, maybe there is some use for
18 nuclear power that could be used by transmitting it over
19 long distances from some isolated source. But here we have
20 a situation that is with us now, not in the future. If
21 Three Mile Island is closed down, the nuclear industry is
22 not going to collapse, if it has anything to commend it.

23 But I'm going to stop now. It made me feel
24 better to talk. But we are in a terrible situation. It's
25 a shame that you people even have to sit there and listen to

1 this and judge it, because really there is nothing to judge.
2 It cannot be reopened in the situation it is. It would
3 be tantamount to if there were a fire in a dynamite factory
4 and opening one half before you had the fire out in the
5 other half. I mean, it's so elementary, that there's
6 nothing to talk about.

7 At the least, that thing, Unit No. 1, cannot be
8 opened until they get this thing cleaned up.

9 I just want to say one other thing. The worst
10 nuclear accident that ever occurred we think was not a
11 reactor, it was a situation that is tantamount to a cleanup
12 operation. In other words, in Russia, in the Ural Mountains,
13 they were disposing of spent material from a reprocessing
14 plant. They did not thoroughly understand the nature of
15 it. It was buried it. It recombined, and to this day that
16 village is -- the houses have been leveled to the ground.
17 They were burned so that it would not remain as a monument
18 to this thing.

19 You must drive by at 70-miles an hour to minimize
20 exposure to radioactivity. And as much as I hate to say
21 this in front of these people, we are in greater danger
22 now than we were during the time of the accident.

23 I'm sorry I had to take your time.

24 (Applause.)

25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: John Murdoch?

POOR ORIGINAL

1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF JOHN MURDOCH,
2 CAMP H. L., PENNSYLVANIA.

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Murdoch will be followed
4 by Louise Dufour, and then by Barbara Herschkowitz.

5 MR. MURDOCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board:
6 My name is John Murdoch, M-u-r-d-o-c-h. I'm a resident of
7 Lower Allen Township, Cumberland County.

8 I reside approximately 12 miles from TMI. I
9 have lived there for 27 years. I am a native Pennsylvanian.
10 My ancestors, seven generations ago, came to this area and
11 settled in Carlisle. In the intervening years, the family
12 has moved elsewhere, but when I came here I felt that I was
13 coming home.

14 Prior to March 28th, I had no particular interest
15 in nuclear power, nor a position concerning it. Since that
16 time, I have become very active in the situation. I'm an
17 elected member of the Steering Committee of TMIA. I'm active
18 in the Mechanicsburg area group. I'm active on a number of
19 task forces involving that situation.

20 My principal concern this morning has to do with
21 the financial capability of Met Ed or its associated
22 companies to adequately and safely operate that plant.
23 Specifically, Unit 1.

24 Now the Public Utility Commission has announced
25 that it is going to hold hearings beginning December 10 on

1379 J67

1 those specific aspects as to whether or not the Company's
2 operating license should be lifted. Petitions have been
3 made to postpone NRC actions until that decision is
4 finalized.

5 I think that any company in the financial
6 position of Met Ed could logically be expected to begin
7 cutting corners in operation, in housekeeping procedures,
8 and in cleanup procedures.

9 I'm not talking now of reducing the pay of the
10 heads of the company. I think that's mainly window-dressing.
11 But I do have a concern as to whether or not safety will be
12 the primary concern in installing the safety measures, in
13 housekeeping procedures, and whether safety-grade equipment
14 will be utilized in preference to what might pass and would
15 be cheaper.

16 I think that the entire nuclear industry is
17 going to have to be dragged kicking and screaming into the
18 solar century.

19 Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, sir.

22 Louise Dufour.

23 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF LOUISE DUFOUR,
24 PHOENISVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA.

25 MS. DUFOUR: Good morning. I haven't prepared

1 anything to speak with. I've been thinking a little bit
2 about what I wanted to say this morning on the way over
3 here from Harrisburg. I live near Valley Forge, and I am
4 a coordinator, a paid staff, although behind in pay, for
5 a citizens group that formed in 1970 when Philadelphia
6 Electric proposed to build a nuclear station out by
7 Philadelphia. That group has been in existence for 10 years.
8 We had a staff person for 2 years, couldn't fund it any
9 longer, and have been working to educate people on what the
10 nuclear industry was doing to us.

11 After the accident, I had been in the Harrisburg
12 area, and I went back to my home which is in Valley Forge,
13 and the group decided to hire someone to work full time
14 because we feel what has happened is so serious and has
15 grave implications, as it always has had, for the people
16 around here, the children that will be born, the mothers --
17 and myself as a mother, if I should choose to live around
18 the Limerick Plant, should it ever be finished.

19 I got started in this whole movement 10 years
20 ago when I was in high school, because two of my professors
21 whom I trusted, seemed to have some questions
22 about what nuclear energy was doing to people. Radiation
23 is an invisible pollution.

24 I went with my professors to the emergency core
25 cooling system hearings that the Atomic Energy Commission

1 was holding back then, and my gut reaction to it was that
2 people there really didn't know what they were doing and
3 it scared me, and I have been scared ever since, and I
4 have been working through my college years actively in
5 trying to help people understand what was going on.

6 It's not very easy when you have utilities with
7 a lot of money and a vested interest to spend telling
8 people that radiation doesn't hurt you. Perhaps it
9 doesn't -- Well, it's very clear that it does, to me; it's
10 not clear to some other people, and I think it is too soon
11 to be sure what the consequences of this accident have been.

12 Members from where I live who were not concerned
13 before the accident went to Florida, because they were
14 scared. We have people from this area who came to my home
15 town.

16 People keep talking about "experts" in this
17 field. It's very clear that neither the utilities -- and
18 with all due respect to you -- nor the NRC knows what
19 they are doing. This is really an advanced technology, and
20 I don't think we have it under control yet, and may never
21 have it under control. It is time, before you go ahead
22 with making a decision on opening this reactor, or continuing
23 the operation of any other reactors -- which I think should
24 not continue until some of these questions are resolved --
25 that you start listening to people who may not be experts, but

POOR ORIGINAL

can have a reaction to life and wanting to preserve it.

1 I used to live in Harrisburg, and I participated
2 in a three-person demonstration outside TMI before the
3 accident ever occurred. After that, I happened to stop
4 in the visitor's center. Someone was telling me that most
5 of the people around here weren't too concerned about the
6 plant. They said there had been a minor demonstration a
7 couple of days ago -- not knowing I'd been the person
8 there, and I didn't say anything about it.

9 And then he went on to talk about the anti-
10 nuclear movement and said, "Actually, no nuke groups have
11 helped to promote the safety of this technology."
12

13 He went on to explain something I don't know a
14 lot about, having to do with hanging bags over the reactor
15 core -- it's some new system -- in the event of an accident,
16 to drop, and I am learning still about this. And I don't
17 know exactly what he meant, but he said that this had been
18 instituted because of citizen concern about this whole core
19 cooling system.

20 Then this morning when I was going through some
21 of my newspaper clippings before I came here, I saw in the
22 New York Times from November 2nd that the NRC had had an
23 emergency meeting called because there was some question as
24 to whether there would be a loss-of-coolant in the reactor
25 core. It's been 10 years since I went to that first meeting,

1 and they didn't seem to know what they're doing, and it
2 doesn't seem like it's gotten any better. They say that
3 the experts now find that there isn't any hazard, but it's
4 apparent that Commissioner Hendrie didn't realize that
5 when he had to call the emergency meeting.

6 This is really serious! It's just appalling that
7 the situation could be such. I wish you would listen to
8 the people around here. They have had enough. People all
9 over the country are starting to organize. We have all had
10 enough.

11 We may be facing an energy crisis. I think it's
12 manufactured. I think there's a long way this country could
13 go and the utilities could go towards conservation. I
14 don't mean "lights out" conservation; I mean energy
15 efficient use.

16 In Sweden, they have the same standard of
17 living as we have with half the per capita energy consump-
18 tion, because they don't let waste heat go out the stacks
19 like they do at Three Mile Island; they use the heat -- the
20 waste heat, to heat buildings around the plant. That is
21 energy efficiency, and we could do that here.

22 I think you ought to be sympathetic to the
23 feelings of the majority of people around here in not opening
24 either Unit 1 or Unit 2 ever again.

25 If the nuclear industry can stand on its own feet,

1 whatever happens with Metropolitan Edison will have nothing
2 to do with its future.

3 I might point out that I don't think we've even
4 begun to pay the cost of the accident. I don't even mean
5 in health; I'm talking strictly in terms of the economics.
6 We don't know what we're going to do with the radioactive
7 wastes. We're generating it. It's all over the world.

8 When I was in college, my thesis advisor was on
9 a panel set up by Governor Grasso to evaluate the future of
10 nuclear power in the state, and they concluded that they
11 could technologically deal with some of the problems like
12 radioactive waste, but they didn't think they could deal
13 with the terrorism that could come into play should anyone
14 with such an evil intention make a move.

15 And I don't like to think in that extreme, but
16 it is something to be considered. People don't think about,
17 when we're talking about national safety, the fact that
18 these plants are sitting around and are potential sites for
19 an enemy to hit on.

20 It just seems that a lot more thought ought to
21 go into what we as a Nation are going to do with our energy
22 problem, and what we have already done to people, probably
23 unbeknownst to the utilities when they got into this, and
24 even to the Atomic Energy Commission when it began promoting
25 it, but it's obvious that the cheap, safe power that we had

POOR ORIGINAL

3-20 JWB

1139

thought we were going to have isn't here anymore, and
probably never will be. And because of that. I think we
ought to just look extremely carefully at what we're doing.

and JWB3

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

LRW-4 fols

1379 074

3
7
2
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1rw4-1

LIMITED APPEARANCE OF BARBARA HERSCHKOWITZ

MS. HERSCHKOWITZ: Members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, my name is Barbara Herschkowitz and I guess you might call me a concerned housewife who lives within a twenty mile radius of Three Mile Island.

It amazes me, and how nice it is, to judge anything just on one phase. It seems that we are talking about Three Mile Island just from an environmental viewpoint. Great, we all want a safe environment for our children, but if we are talking only about environmental safety, okay, let's do away with Three mile Island. Let's do away with the nuclear industry in the United States. Let's do away with the chemical industry and let's do away with our automobiles. Then we will have a safe environment for our children.

I think that we need to judge this from other viewpoints. Why more emphasis hasn't been put on an economic impact study of the permanent closing of Unit 1 I would like to know. I wonder how many people in this room in this area have thought that if Unit 1 doesn't reopen or if we don't have nuclear energy, how it will affect the rate of employment within a fifty mile radius of Three Mile Island within the next two years.

How many companies are going to have to close down because there is no cheap fuel available? Their energy costs will go up and they will have to cut back on employees or

lrw4-2

perhaps go bankrupt. How many people have thought of how closing down Three Mile Island can affect the economy in the area and, therefore, the crime rate?

It just disturbs me that we are only looking at one phase. And then, how nice it would be to do away with nuclear power in the whole United States and how it could affect the economy of the United States and possibly even the survival of the United States as a democracy in the world community.

I think it is very simplistic just to look at the environmental side. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

Are there any other requests? Show your hands, please. All right, we will begin with you, Ma'am.

LIMITED APPEARANCE OF RHODA CARR

MS. CARR: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, my name is Rhoda Carr. I live at 1402 Marine Drive, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

As a sort of introduction, I would like to say that I am a suburban homemaker and an inactive nurse instructor. My husband and I have three children, ages eight, five and two, and their care at this time consumes most of my -- at the present time, their care consumes most of my time.

Although we presently live in the Colonial Park area of Harrisburg, last year we entered contract for a farm located several miles north of Middletown. We were attracted

POOR ORIGINAL

1142

lrw4-3

to the area because of its central location and it being such an area steeped in history. We also own several apartment houses in the Middletown area and just really find the area attractive.

We entered this contract, however, feeling very uncomfortable about Three Mile Island being so close. In fact, you can see the towers from the backyard of the farmhouse. And then the accident occurred this past March, and I must say that any skimpy trust we did have in the safety of this plant crumbled.

Now what plans do we make? One thing sure, we did not feel we could go back on our word so we went ahead and settled for the farm this past August. At the present time, we feel torn between the choice we have to make between moving down onto the farm and being able to enjoy the quality of life possible there and the repulsion of being located so close to that nuclear power plant.

My husband and I monitor carefully what our children watch on television. I plan our meals carefully and try to discourage junk foods in their diets. My summer is spent virtually in the kitchen preserving food for the better health of my family.

However, I just find it irritating that we have no control of the amount of radiation they received during normal operation of TMI and during the accident. To me, this is an

1379 077

POOR ORIGINAL

1143

lrw4-4

outright violation of individual rights.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

There are those who claim the amount of radiation received was insignificant. I'm sorry, but we didn't even want that much. I feel uncomfortable having an irresponsible company with such a shaky financial base in charge of operating a nuclear power plant, much less cleaning up a damaged reactor.

I would urge you to seriously consider the problem of waste disposal. How moral is it to ask future generations to be responsible for protecting the dangerous wastes that are present in society? I think it is preposterous.

This problem is addressed most assuredly by not producing these wastes at all. I get the feeling that those in power are really not looking out for the best interests of the public and that feeling is disturbing. I get the feeling that those in power feel there is no other choice, that it is something we absolutely need, regardless of the risks, and that feeling is disturbing.

We don't absolutely need to have something that is going to be harmful to us and to our children. There are alternatives. Economically, the renewable resources are much more sound. Much more also could be said about conservation of energy. It has been my observation that those of our friends who have opted for simplifying their lifestyles have a much higher quality of life. Conservation is a better way of life, not a negative alternative.

1379 078

lrw4-5

1 I have been opposed to nuclear power ever since I
2 studied chemistry and physics in college. After taking a
3 course in disaster nursing in nursing school, however, I be-
4 came even more aware of the seriousness of the subject. As
5 our instructor presented the scenarios to be dealt with in
6 case of a nuclear catastrophe, I shuddered and was horrified
7 thinking of the possibility of this nuclear catastrophe happen-
8 ing. I shudder more when I consider the irony of the fact that
9 a nuclear catastrophe just about happened, not from an enemy
10 nation, however, but from our own technology.

11 In the past, I have grudgingly tolerated nuclear
12 power and have been suspicious of it. The best laid plans of
13 men will fail. Inevitably, things will go wrong from time to
14 time. Safety systems will prove unsafe. That's life.

15 But when you are dealing with consequences affecting
16 so many people over such large areas, the risk is incompre-
17 hensible. It is unconscionable to think of operating a nuclear
18 power plant so close to prime Lancaster County farmland, so
19 close to such population centers, on a river next to a damaged
20 reactor.

21 Let's face it: Locating a nuclear generating plant
22 at Three Mile Island was a mistake. A big mistake. An ex-
23 pensive mistake. But I urge you to be not so preoccupied with
24 the monies involved here and consider instead the total picture,
25 the peace of mind we in this area need and the public health

1379 079

POOR ORIGINAL

1145

lrw4-6

1 and safety. When I asked my neighbors in the suburbs what
2 should I say when I go down here today, they said tell them to
3 close it permanently as a nuclear generating plant.

4 When I asked friends who live in the city what I
5 should say, they said tell them to shut it down permanently.

6 When I talked to friends in the country, I asked them
7 what I should say and they responded close it permanently.

8 I say close it permanently as a nuclear generating
9 plant. Yet, deep inside, is this haunting fear that, after
10 you patiently listen to us vent our feelings and anxieties,
11 and I appreciate your kindness in listening, you will simply
12 slap the wrists, so to speak, of the companies involved and
13 impose stronger safety standards to try to appease the public
14 and then go on with the plans to preserve the industry and
15 open TMI.

16 I have a deep real faith in God, and this faith in
17 God provided security for me and my family as we experienced
18 the trauma of the nuclear nightmare. I prayed constantly
19 during the incident and can remember praying Sunday evening
20 with my sister-in-law -- we had a few spare moments together,
21 a few quiet moments toget-er -- that God would miraculously
22 intervene and reduce the size of the bubble.

23 On Monday, indeed, that's what happened. The bubble
24 was reduced greatly in size, with no one being able to really
25 give an explanation for such a speedy response. I am thankful

1379 080

lrw4-7

1 that God is ultimately in control. However, I also firmly
2 believe that God gave us minds to think and reason and recog-
3 nize a risky, dangerous situation. God gave us strength to
4 refrain from being so preoccupied with materialism that we
5 allow Three Mile Island to reopen, exposing not hundreds but
6 thousands to that same risk that we flirted so closely with
7 that week in March of 1979.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

10 Mrs. Kinney.

11 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF PAULA KINNEY

12 MS. KINNEY: My name is Paula Kinney. I am a wife
13 and mother and I live in Middletown.

14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We are getting signals that you
15 are not being heard. You will have to talk closely into the
16 microphone.

17 MS. KINNEY: My name is Paula Kinney. I am a wife
18 and mother. I have three children and live in Middletown.

19 I have no prepared statement. I want to speak to
20 you from my heart. Ever since my children were conceived,
21 my husband and I have made sacrifices, including quitting
22 smoking, which was extremely difficult. We took them to the
23 doctor for their monthly checkups, their shots, to the dentist.
24 My grocery bill is horrendous. I buy fruits and vegetables.
25 I, too, do not like my children to have junk food.

1379 081

POOR ORIGINAL

1147

1774-8

1 I feel as though, because of a company's greed,
2 because of a company's carelessness, because of neglect, what-
3 ever, in one day -- in one day last March all that we have
4 done, everything we have done, is wiped out. Gone.

5 This whole thing is so unbelievable, it's worse than
6 a nightmare because at least in a nightmare you can wake up
7 and it's over. I'm not the same person that I was, and I
8 resent Met Ed for that. I resent them taking away my innocence.
9 I was always very trusting. I was very happy-go-lucky. I
10 don't trust anyone any more. I'm sorry, and I don't like my-
11 self, I don't like to be like this but I can't help it.

12 I am a whole new person. I feel as though I was
13 raped, I was robbed, I was beaten, and no one cares. Nobody
14 even wants to really listen. I have never been into anything
15 like Women's Lib. I have always been very happy with my little
16 life, my family, cooking and just kind of feeling as though my
17 government is taking care of me. No problems.

18 But I know now the more I read, the more I really
19 get into this, that I realize I feel so strongly about this,
20 so very, very strongly, that I will do anything -- and I mean
21 I will do anything -- to keep it closed.

22 I thank you.

23 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF SANDRA CAPPELLI

24 MS. CAPPELLI: My name is Sandra Capelli. I sent in
25 a written statement. The only reason I am speaking is that

1379 082

POOR ORIGINAL

1148

lrw4-9

1 thereis one thing I would like to say that I don't think I
2 included in my statement.

3 I live right here in Hershey, 117 West Granada
4 Avenue. I am within the ten mile radius. When we evacuated,
5 I went to Washington, D.C. where my family lives. There was a
6 threat at the time that I left on Friday afternoon that there
7 was a meltdown that possibly was imminent. I know something
8 about what a meltdown is, which I thought was quite frightening.
9 That's the main reason that I left, plus getting information
10 hours and sometimes days after was of concern to me.

11 I am a homemaker. I am also interested in the
12 economic point. I have read in Time Magazine within the past
13 month that the national average to pay per kilowatt hour for
14 electricity is four cents. I called Hershey Electric, who
15 deals with Met Ed, to find out what at this particular time we
16 are paying per kilowatt hour. We are paying six cents per
17 kilowatt hour, which is two cents above the national average.

18 I said fine. Now I would like to know, this time
19 last year, while we were receiving energy from Three Mile
20 Island, what we were paying. At that time, we were paying
21 five cents. That still means that we were -- probably the
22 national average was lower than four cents this time last year.
23 So we have always paid here, with getting energy from Three
24 Mile Island, above the national average for electricity.
25 That bothers me. Paying anything over a certain amount bothers

1379 083

lrw4-10

1 me.

2 I sat in yesterday afternoon for a little while, last
3 night for a little while, and this morning. I have a child who
4 is at story hour, which is why I am in here now. I certainly
5 heard pros and cons for or against the reopening. I have
6 heard, I would say, seventy percent at least while I have been
7 sitting in this room who are against it.

8 I know that in national elections, when someone gets
9 sixty percent of the vote, which has not happened for a long
10 time, it is called a landslide. It means that person is in.
11 That set of issues is set up for the country. I feel, on that
12 basis, alone, you ought to consider the closing of Three Mile
13 Island.

14 I think Met Ed has shown thoroughly that they are
15 irresponsible. I think they should lose their license. I
16 think when one industry collapses, there is something there to
17 take its place and it is not a mass unemployment situation.

18 Thank you.

19 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF CARRIE LIGHT

20 MS. LIGHT: My name is Carrie Light. I really did
21 not come here to speak today. As a matter of fact, I plan to
22 speak tomorrow, but you seem to have a little time.

23 I was struck last evening by one thing, a small
24 question that came from a member of the Board asking a woman
25 who had spoken to clarify what she meant about sirens. And

POOR ORIGINAL

1150

lrw4-11

1 hat really struck me because, at that moment, I realized
2 there was no way that any of you sitting there could really
3 comprehend what that woman was talking about, about sirens.

4 Just as, for a very long time, I couldn't comprehend
5 it, either. I am a psychiatric nurse and I was out of the
6 area when this happened. I was at my job in Camp Hill. I
7 didn't hear the sirens in Middletown. When I found out about
8 it, my task was to try to get home to Middletown, which was
9 different.

10 For months, months, months, I kept hearing these
11 people -- believe me, I hear these people talking all the time.
12 Maybe it is because of the kind of work I do and people know,
13 because I do that kind of work, I will be able to hear what
14 they say or listen to what they say, but it seems like since
15 March 28, I have done nothing but listen to people feeling
16 hurt and being frightened.

17 The sirens keep coming up and up and up. Even my
18 mother talks about it, talks about the sirens. Every time an
19 ambulance siren goes off, she has to find out what it is. I
20 couldn't get it together. I couldn't figure out what it was.

21 Until I was coming home from work and the radio was
22 on in my car and the news came on. There was a flash about
23 Three Mile Island. I felt this terrible surge in me, this
24 terrible feeling, and I realized that, while everybody else in
25 town was listening to the sirens and being so terrified, I

1379 085

lrw4-12

1 was trying to get to the town, to my family. What I was
2 sensitized to was the radio and the news on the radio.

3 And that still happens. I really pay closer
4 attention to it now, to see if it was just a fluke or if it
5 is really there. I realize I very rarely ever turn the radio
6 on in my car any more. I don't want to hear this in that
7 particular situation. That has been one of the things I have
8 been sensitized to.

9 I hear these people in my community. These are the
10 people I have grown up with. I have helped raise them. They
11 helped raise me. We are peers. They hurt so much and they are
12 sensitized to things I am afraid you can't quite comprehend.
13 And it frightens me that you might not be able to really hear
14 what they are saying to you about this, because this is real
15 and this is serious. At this point in time, it cuts deep in.
16 It is not an intellectual issue any more. It is not a techni-
17 cal issue any more. It has become a very deep, real, serious
18 personal issue for a large number of people. A large number
19 of people who cannot escape.

20 This is another thing that frightens me. I think
21 in terms of escape. If you open it, well, I can leave -- I'm
22 young, I'm mobile, I can do that -- but that's an old commun-
23 ity and a lot of the residents in that area are not young,
24 mobile, professional people; they are people who are effect-
25 ively trapped, and given the fears that they have, given what

lrw4-13

they have already been sensitized to, when that thing reopens, I, too, have a great deal of basic lack of believe that it will not be opened; I suspect we will go through all the rituals and it will reopen.

When that happens, if that happens, those people don't have any recourse. They can't get up and go. They are stuck. They are trapped. They are trapped in their own houses.

When you talk to people about whether or not they feel safe or how safe they feel, you realize they don't feel safe in their own homes any more. I am sure some of you are familiar with some of the work that has been done on human nature and human beings and basic needs, and one of the most basic needs, if you believe Maslow, is for safety; underpinning every other higher human motivation lies a basic need for safety.

And when people don't feel that, it doesn't give them much opportunity to grow and to exhibit and practice those kinds of human qualities that we associate with higher forms or higher development, human development. So you really put people in a rotten position as far as being humans.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

DR. JOHNSRUD: I would say, representing the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, a petitioner in this

lrw4-14

proceeding, might I add a word at this point? Not as a formal limited appearance but a response for the record?

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes. We have the time and the opportunity. I hope that you will recognize that the rules expressly prohibit it, but we will allow it, anyway, and not get into any of the business of the litigation.

DR. JOHNSRUD: Yes, sir. I want to make one very brief comment concerning --

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Did you identify yourself?

DR. JOHNSRUD: I believe I did but I will --

CHAIRMAN SMITH: The Board knows who you are, of course, but I wasn't sure the audience did know.

This speaker is representing one of the intervenors in the adjudication and will be active in the actual hearing on the actual issues. There has been an understanding among the parties to the adjudication that, during this session, we will not make arguments on the issues to be decided in the hearing. This was the nature of our exchange with Dr. Johnsrud.

DR. JOHNSRUD: Thank you.

I merely want to add for the record at this stage a response to the comments that have come clearly from the hearts of people living in this area, that make this proceeding a matter unlike any other Nuclear Regulatory Commission Atomic Safety and Licensing Board proceeding of the past.

I have been struck in the last four days of the

1379 088

lrw4-15

1 prehearing conference, in which the arguments concerning the
2 contentions at issue in the case have been given, by the calm-
3 ness, the politeness, the courteous manner in which the inter-
4 vening parties, who are, themselves, like the people who have
5 spoken here yesterday and today, residents of Central Pennsyl-
6 vania, have conducted themselves.

7 They have experienced what the people this morning
8 have tried to express to the Board. They have experienced a
9 trauma. They are deeply affected. They find themselves in a
10 situation of arguing the niceties of specificity, of basis, of
11 merit of contentions, timeliness of arguments, and they are
12 attempting to do so in the hope that the legal procedures
13 provided by our federal government will, in fact, respond to a
14 need, to a depth of feeling on the part of people here in
15 Pennsylvania that far transcends those legal niceties.

16 I would simply ask this Board throughout the actual
17 hearing procedure and in your subsequent deliberations to t
18 into special account what you are hearing from the people who
19 have lived through an accident that was not supposed to happen
20 but did.

21 We, as the intervening parties, will do all we can
22 to assist in building the strongest, most complete possible
23 record. I would note that there have been exchanges of a
24 rather sharp nature already in the proceeding, and I would
25 hope that the Board understands that these intervenors are

POOR ORIGINAL

1155

lrw4-16

1 people who have been affected.

2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are there any additional requests
3 for oral statements?

4 Do you wish to make a statement? If you would come
5 forward immediately and make it...we have been waiting for
6 you.

7 (Laughter)

END#4

8
9
10 1379 090
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF EDWINA CODER,
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

MS. CODER: I am Edwina Coder, president of
the League of Women Voters of Lancaster County.

We speak with the support of the League of Women
Voters of Pennsylvania, and the League of Women Voters of
the United States.

The League is a grass-roots organization whose
purpose is to study and act on governmental issues selected
by our membership.

The current League position on energy was reached
as a result of a recent two-year study on a national level.
One year of that study in the Lancaster League was focused
primarily on nuclear energy.

We believe that Three Mile Island Unit No. 1
should not be allowed to return to operation at the present
time. The result of Congressional, Presidential, legislative
hearings and other inquiries into the causes and implications
of the accident at Three Mile Island No. 2 have not all been
released, and are not all fully known.

In order to ensure the health and safety of
citizens and the environment, a broad range of questions
should be satisfactorily answered and measures taken to
correct safety regulations and practices before TMI No. 1
is permitted to resume operation.

1 Some of the factors in the accident that need to
2 be addressed are:

3 A, the reactor design;

4 B, operator error, operator training and work
5 schedules;

6 C, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's role in letting
7 the plant go on line; and

8 D, the question of utility tax credits for 1978.

9 Safety factors that are still very much in question
10 involve communications with governmental officials responsible
11 for public safety, and lack of effective evacuation plans
12 and effective monitoring of plant releases.

13 Concerns about the Babcock & Wilcox design
14 reactors continue. This type of reactor appears to have
15 particular defects that make it dangerous. The company seems
16 to have failed to convey vital information to the utility
17 about a previous equipment failure and near-accident elsewhere
18 that might have averted the Three Mile Island accident.

19 It is our understanding that Units 1 and 2 share
20 some plumbing. To reopen Unit 1 under these circumstances
21 seems to pose an unacceptable risk.

22 Start-up of Unit 1 seems imprudent when water
23 containment problems of Unit 2 have not been fully solved.
24 The waste management capacity of Unit 1 may be needed
25 during any attempted clean-up operations of Unit 2.

POOR ORIGINAL

1 Several incidents have occurred which do not
2 reassure the public that their health and safety, and that
3 of their environment, are of the highest priority.

4 These include the release of radioactive iodine
5 into the atmosphere, when filters were not replaced by the
6 utility during procedures to bring the damaged reactor under
7 control. And the release of water before testing into the
8 Susquehanna River in early August.

9 The League understands that this is part of NRC
10 procedures. Both of these incidents took place with the
11 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Environ-
12 mental Resources personnel on the Three Mile Island site.

13 More recently, it was discovered that the NRC
14 Commissioners were unaware that the city of Lancaster and
15 the Susquehanna Valley Alliance had rejected an environmental
16 assessment study by the NRC in connection with the lawsuits
17 that they had filed, requesting the environmental impact
18 statement.

19 And if I may depart for just one minute, I am aware
20 that today they are being discussed in court.

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: What is that? Is that the EPICOR,
22 or is there another --

23 MS. CODER: Well, the SVA, the Susquehanna Valley
24 Alliance, lawsuit goes beyond just the EPICOR statement.
25 I realize that they are talking about that. They are also

1 concerned about requiring that an environmental impact state-
2 ment be made concerning the clean-up of --

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, I understand that.

4 MS. CODER: -- of Three Mile Island before --

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I understand.

6 MS. CODER: -- before that proceeds.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, thank you.

8 MS. CODER: It seems that there may be a serious
9 lack of communication between NRC Staff and the Commissioners.
10 In the unprecedented situation that TMI presents, there are
11 still many unknown risks associated with the damaged reactor,
12 including both immediate and long-term radioactive waste
13 disposal, and an environmental impact study is needed to
14 fully assess this situation.

15 Until the public can be reassured that health
16 and safety measures for the citizen are prime concerns
17 of General Public Utilities and the Metropolitan Edison
18 Company, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and other
19 governmental bodies and agencies directly responsible, the
20 League of Women Voters believes that the Unit No. 1 at
21 Three Mile Island should remain closed.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ma'am, would you explain your
23 reference to the 1978 tax credit?

24 MS. CODER: It was our understanding that
25 Metropolitan Edison had been very anxious because of the tax

1 relief that would be due them by bringing that plant on line
2 before the end of that operating year.

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

4 You have amazingly touched upon the issues that we
5 have to hear. I mean you have referred to almost every one
6 that I can think of that -- you've been doing your homework
7 in this case, I can see.

8 MS. CODER: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Because you have mentioned the
10 issues that we have to hear.

11 MS. CODER: Thank you.

12 [Applause.]

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are there any further requests?

14 Yes, ma'am.

15 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF PENNY JOHNSTON.

16 MS. JOHNSTON: I am Penny Johnston, president
17 of the Lancaster Branch of the American Association of
18 University Women.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Penny? Was that Penny?

20 MS. JOHNSTON: Penny.

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Penny Johnston.

22 MS. JOHNSTON: Uh-huh.

23 DR. JORDAN: Speak more loudly and into the
24 microphone.

25 MS. JOHNSTON: All right.

POOR ORIGINAL

1 Lancaster is concerned over the opening of TMI
2 No. 1. We are concerned with health and safety due to
3 clean-up operations with TMI No. 2.

4 At our branch meeting Monday night we passed a
5 resolution supporting the Lancaster City suit. That resolu-
6 tion read:

7 "Resolved: That the Lancaster Branch of the
8 American Association of University Women go on
9 record as favoring the lawsuit instituted by
10 the City of Lancaster against the Nuclear
11 Regulatory Commission to prohibit the dumping
12 of radioactive water into the Susquehanna River
13 by the Metropolitan Edison Company, subsidiary
14 of General Public Utilities."

15 We have concern over the safety factors of dumping
16 water, and we are concerned that until this problem is solved,
17 that perhaps there should be, the other reactor should not be
18 opened.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

20 Any further statements?

21 Yes, ma'am.

22 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF JANE COBY.

23 MS. COBY: I am Jane Coby, speaking as a citizen.
24 I am a board member of AAUW, and a recent board member of
25 the League of Women Voters, having been intimately involved

1 in the study of this.

2 I am opposed to the reopening of Unit 1 as premature
3 I think that it revolves around the feeling more for the
4 bottom line economic necessity than for the health and safety
5 of the people of this area.

6 The American Association of University Women
7 nationally is currently involved in the topic "Managing
8 Resources for Tomorrow."

9 A lot of the discussion about the EPICOR treatment
10 revolves around the fact that tritium, an isotope of hydrogen,
11 does not go away. It has a long radioactive life.

12 There was an article in last night's paper about
13 the situation in Arizona, in which the tritium clogged the
14 valves of a plant that has been closed. Tritium is one real
15 concern for the health and safety of the people.

16 As you panelists know, the HEW report of 1976
17 relating to the health hazards of low level radioactivity
18 have indicated that there are always hazards in low level
19 radioactivity.

20 I'm speaking not as a science-oriented person,
21 but on the political and moral and ethical grounds that it is
22 imperative that we not reopen Unit 1 until more knowledge
23 is gathered.

24 I know that the Lancaster City lawsuit is requesting
25 an environmental impact statement, preferably from an outside

1 agency. I think we have found that the Nuclear Regulatory
2 agency has also indicated some interest in prosecution of the
3 people in Metropolitan Edison who were involved in some of the
4 work on the March 28th occasion; not because of any premeditated
5 negligence, but because of some gross negligence.

6 I think that primitive society often cares about
7 their environment. Can we do less?

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

10 [Applause.]

11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Anyone further?

12 [No response.]

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does any member of the audience
14 have any questions about our procedures that -- not
15 necessarily about the issues, but the procedures that we
16 could help you with?

17 Yes, ma'am.

18 MS. CODER: I have a question relating to the
19 dumping of the water. I am very much aware that the people
20 who are located around the mouth of the Susquehanna River,
21 going into the Chesapeake Bay -- and those are mainly Maryland
22 I am referring to -- will there be NRC hearings held in their
23 area?

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't know. You might like
25 to perhaps ask members of the Staff who can explain that to you.

1 Our hearing jurisdiction is limited to the proposed reopening
2 of Unit 1 and the effect of waste management on Unit 1.

3 MS. COOPER: Right. I realize that.

4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Which would be in a different
5 direction than your question. So I don't know. But I am sure
6 that the Staff, perhaps afterwards, could tell you, or even
7 now.

8 Anything further?

9 Would you come to the microphone?

10 MS. DEVORE: I was just wondering if the three of
11 you could take a little time to tell us about what you have
12 done with the NRC prior to this, if you wouldn't mind.

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: You mean what we have done at
14 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission before this?

15 MS. DEVORE: Right, before you were assigned to
16 this.

17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, all right. All right, that's
18 fine.

19 I came to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in
20 1975 with a background largely as a trial attorney in anti-
21 trust, and there was at that time a great deal of antitrust
22 interest in the NRC, and I presided over hearings of that
23 nature, and then I got into some licensing cases involving
24 construction permits, a special proceeding involving manage-
25 ment capability, and one of the utilities -- I'm involved

1 In several operating license cases. I'm the administrative
2 law judge for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. In that
3 respect I have presided alone over several penalty cases,
4 one civil penalty case.

5 If you have a specific question, I --
6 Maybe this might be helpful.

7 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is composed
8 of five Commissioners who are appointed by the President and
9 confirmed by the Senate for a term of years. Once appointed
10 and confirmed, they may not be removed from office except
11 by impeachment.

12 The Atomic Energy Act specifically provides for
13 Atomic Safety & Licensing Boards and Board panels. This is a
14 statute passed by Congress. It has been in the law for many
15 years.

16 The statute says that there shall be a group of
17 people who are selected because of their particular qualifica-
18 tions who shall be available to serve on Atomic Safety &
19 Licensing Boards.

20 As a result of that law and the enabling regulations
21 in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, there is a panel of
22 approximately 50 to 60 scientists, both nuclear scientists
23 and environmental scientists, and a group of lawyers. Most
24 of the lawyers are on the panel, are full-time.

25 Now the members of this panel who serve on Boards

1 are pursuant to regulation and law, appointed by an official
2 resolution of the Commissioners. by law and by statute.

3 We can have no other responsibilities in our work. We are
4 judicial officers.

5 We cannot take an investigative assignment.
6 The highest ranking members of the Staff of the Nuclear
7 Regulatory Commission may not control in one whit what we
8 do.

9 Indeed, the reverse is true, we can, after an
10 adjudication, require actions of them.

11 We cannot be removed from our jobs except by an
12 action, by a reverse action. There has to be an official
13 action by the Nuclear Regulatory Commissioners.

14 As it so happens, in my case, and I am the only
15 case, as the administrative law judge, I can't even be removed
16 by them. They would have to bring an action against me in
17 another agency.

18 We have as much independence from the rest of
19 the Commission as it is possible to create, and the
20 independence is not only theoretical, but it is a practical
21 one. Our office spaces are separated from, in most instances,
22 sometimes temporary arrangements require us to be in closer
23 contact with the enforcement staff, but when that happens,
24 there is no communication, by understanding.

25 We are just a separate group, constituted as

ar5-12

1 judicial officers. Our decisions may be reviewed only on the
2 issued written decision.

3 What I mean by that is if we make a decision in
4 this case which the Commissioners or anyone else does not
5 like, there is not one thing they can do about it, except on
6 another decision reverse us, which is then appealable to the
7 courts.

8 Is that helpful?

9 Now, would you like to hear about the actual
10 participation from the scientific members of the Board? Would
11 that be helpful?

12 Dr. Little?

13 DR. LITTLE: I'm a part-time member of the panel.
14 I am currently involved on a number of cases. One has to do
15 with the siting for a proposed plant in Texas, which would be
16 known as the Bleuville site.

17 I am on two spent fuel pool amendment cases in
18 Zion, Illinois and in Dresden, Illinois.

19 I am on a case dealing with the low level waste
20 site which did operate at Sheffield, Illinois, and is now no
21 longer accepting wastes, and I am also on the Morris, Illinois
22 case, which involves a permanent type of spent fuel storage.

23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Dr. Jordan?

24 DR. LITTLE: I have one other point.

25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry.

1379 102

1 DR. LITTLE: Because of my part-time activities
2 with this panel, in my other work I do not take on any cases
3 in any way related to the nuclear industry.

4 And I might also add to Mr. Smith's comments that
5 we are not allowed to hold any stock in any utility, whether
6 nuclear or otherwise.

7 DR. JORDAN: I have been involved with the Licensing
8 Board, as the Chairman pointed out earlier this morning, for
9 about 10 years, and during that time I have been involved
10 with the granting of construction permits, for the most part;
11 occasionally, operating licenses.

12 A hearing such as this, none of us has been involved
13 in before. This is really breaking new ground, and it is, as
14 Dr. Johnsrud pointed out earlier, it is different than the
15 previous hearings.

16 I am now involved on other licensing boards.
17 Pebble Springs out in Oregon. And I will be going out there
18 to a conference during December.

19 I am also involved in a board that has to do with
20 the Perkins Nuclear Plant in North Carolina.

21 I have just finished being involved with the
22 Monticello Plant.

23 I had been appointed to the Board for the New Haven
24 Nuclear Plant in Northern New York. However, the Applicant
25 there has recently asked that that hearing be indefinitely

1 postponed. No action has been taken, and it is not likely
2 that there will be any involvement there soon.

3 So I have been a professor of nuclear engineering.
4 I am retired from that job. The only outside activity that I
5 have, other than this panel involvement, is that I am an
6 advisory editor to the Journal of Nuclear Safety, which helps
7 me keep up with the general field of nuclear safety.

8 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Has anyone arrived that wishes
9 to make a statement?

10 [No response.]

11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ladies and gentlemen, I guess
12 we have completed the business scheduled for this morning.

13 I see some hands raised in the back.

14 Sir? What was your point?

15 VOICE: I'd just like to make a statement, if it is
16 in order.

17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, that's why we are here.

18 Would you come forward?

19 VOICE: Well, I think I can do it from here.

20 CHAIRMAN SMITH: She can't hear. The trouble is,
21 the reporter can't hear it.

22 VOICE: I see.

23 Where would you like me to speak from?

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Why don't you speak from the
25 microphone, and everyone can hear your statement.

POOR ORIGINAL

1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF DAVE HANDLEY.

2 MR. HANDLEY: My name is Dave Handley, and I didn't
3 come here with this specifically in mind, but since you asked,
4 I guess the statement that I could make would be anti-nuclear
5 energy.

6 I lived in Harrisburg for some time, as the
7 Three Mile Island complex was being built. I had reservations
8 cheerly on the basis of emotion, meaning the magnitude of the
9 complex, et cetera.

10 That emotion, of course, came to full light when
11 we had this -- as Max Ed describes it, I guess, an occurrence
12 or happening or whatever, we call it an accident around here.

13 But what really, I guess my point being is this:
14 We now have an opportunity, it seems, to change the thinking
15 of people like yourselves, if I can presume that you are
16 vitally interested in nuclear energy and the pursuance of
17 that industry.

18 And the reason why I say that is because of your
19 credentials. It's an area obviously you've devoted your life
20 to.

21 I devote my life, obviously, to a different
22 endeavor. I am a salesman. So obviously I can't always be
23 objective.

24 I still have the same emotional problems with
25 nuclear energy as I did when the plant was being built, only

1 it's tenfold or more.

2 I have an 11-year old son who is -- how would I
3 tell you, -- an intelligent young man. I guess we all think
4 our children are, but this boy is.

5 And he asks me questions which startle me, questions
6 concerning his well being, questions concerning whether or not
7 are we going to live in this area, are we moving?

8 He doesn't -- how would I tell you -- he doesn't
9 get this from me, because I have never discussed moving out of
10 this area with him, or he has never heard that conversation from
11 me, but from his peers, it seems that universally there is a
12 definite head problem, if I can say it that way.

13 Now, admittedly, I may have stimulated that
14 because the day of the accident, I was totally in the dark.
15 The day, I think it was Friday that I finally had some
16 inkling of it. In your day-to-day scheduling obviously
17 you are not always articulate to the things that are happening
18 next door, or cognizant.

19 But Friday when I became fully aware of what I
20 heard and felt emotionally from the TV set, et cetera, I
21 took him out of school. And I took him out of school, I
22 thought, rather with a great deal of poise. I just told
23 him that it was a family emergency which we had to attend to,
24 but it seemed the whole school was abuzz with Three Mile
25 Island, and I guess I wasn't fooling him, and particularly

1 when he went to his grandparents 120 miles away, then he knew
2 full well why he was there.

3 I'm not sure that he will ever adjust to the
4 proximity that he is at, with the situation that we have at
5 Three Mile Island.

6 I am totally appalled by the lack of -- how would
7 I tell you -- understanding, it seems, sometimes by my peers,
8 sometimes by the media, sometimes by statements from people
9 like yourself.

10 We talk in terms of safety. Well, my lands, we
11 know safety was the byword, we all understood, until this
12 happened. I mean it was safe. Never mind the fact that I, as
13 one member of my organization, got inside the plant, rented
14 equipment to these people down there, and when we were up on
15 the third floor while they were taking apart a turbine one
16 time, in a 60-foot trailer, and the whole building was doing
17 this (indicating).

18 You know, people can say, well, gee whiz, wasn't
19 that imagination? No, the building in fact moves, okay, it
20 has a quake about it.

21 GE's people said, well, that's normal. Okay,
22 this is what the building does. You are probably aware of this.

23 Now, admittedly you are on a rubber-tired trailer,
24 and the trailer obviously accentuates maybe whatever activity
25 is in the building, but the building has -- and it's designed

1 to do that, et cetera.

2 But coincidentally, as I went through this building,
3 as I stand here before you, this goes back many years ago --
4 Unit 2 wasn't up, just Unit 1 -- there were buckets under
5 pipes, flange sections of pipes, okay, buckets on the floor
6 catching drips.

7 Now I just happen to be one of those naive people
8 that when I got dripped on, as I stand here, so help me God,
9 on this shoulder, and asked the CE guy that was taking me
0 through -- it happened to be the turbine people who were
1 repairing the turbine that was down, checking it over -- he
2 said, "No, Mr. Handley," he said, "you don't have to worry
3 because although those pipes are leaking up there" -- and it's
4 about as high as this ceiling and tremendous noise -- forget
5 that -- noise, as you know, I've been in Bethlehem Steel,
6 where there is much noise -- "you don't have to worry about it,
7 because this is on the cold side of the reactor. That
8 building out there is where the hot stuff is."

9 Okay, so I believed him again. Okay, I'm rather
10 naive, and gee, I'm avaricious, I want his business.

11 Two years later, perhaps my memory serves me, maybe
12 year later, I went back in the same plant for the same type
13 of application, same type of business. Only this time I had
14 to sign something, and that was that no matter what happened
15 to me in that plant, whatever happened to me in the future

1 at that plant -- I guess they still have it down at Met Ed's
2 records -- they are not responsible.

3 I then became more and more cognizant of the fact,
4 well, gee whiz, if nobody is responsible, then how in the
5 world can this place be safe.

6 This is just a little background about the trauma,
7 okay, that I have with it in my mind. I don't know what
8 you do with a billion-dollar installation, or multi-billion-
9 dollar installation, but I know that psychological damage has
10 been done. Not to me, okay. We'll say Dave Handley is 43
11 years old and he will die of other causes. But I've got an
12 11 year old, and he is healthy and happy, okay.

13 But, on the other hand, sometimes some of the
14 things he says are a little spooky to me and a little spooky
15 to his mother, because we question maybe where his head is.

16 Recently, to put a final feel for this, recently I
17 saw -- I guess he's vice president, I don't know what his name
18 is, it's not important to me what his name is, quite frankly.
19 All I know is he is the vice president, I believe, of
20 Metropolitan Edison Company, and he was talking in terms, and
21 it's been in the media now, that we are going to release,
22 because of whatever reason, but for safety we are going to
23 do this, krypton gas. And we have to do this because, by gosh,
24 you know, if it doesn't go out by our making, it could come
25 out by its own methods, breaking seals and therefore there

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

could be a trauma locally.

But if we do it under controlled conditions, you know and release it out into the atmosphere, nobody is going to be damaged. Okay, nobody is going to come away the worst for it.

end 5

1379 110

6-1 JWB

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

Well, this was the same man that I saw being interviewed on Friday morning of the accident who denied any knowledge of an accident. There was a Nader representative being interviewed by the media, again, along with that gentleman. He was angry. Metropolitan Edison's Vice President was angry because the representative from the Nader group was saying, "We think you've got a problem down there."

"No, sir. No problem. We have everything under control."

We have learned since from the Nuclear Regulatory Agency from the highest levels that that was a lie. Now I am in no position to call this man a liar, but I might be in a position, predicated on his past statements, that he's a fool.

He's in a position that he's supposed to know. Why in the world should I have confidence in a statement that he made recently about krypton gas being released into the atmosphere?

I am totally opposed to nuclear energy on my back doorstep, or anybody else's. I'm not sure it's safe anywhere. I understand the Governor recently is now going to open up the dumping grounds again for low-level radiation. But as she articulated it today, it's the state's problem that the power plant is in.

Well, I think then if it is Pennsylvania's problem,

1 then Pennsylvania had better say, "No more power plants,"
2 where it be Berwick, Three Mile Island's restart, or gosh
3 know the one down here.

4 An interesting other point I'd like to just take
5 more of your time. We talk in terms of "cheap nuclear
6 energy." Cheap? When Three Mile Island went down, there
7 was a cost reduction to the consumers of Met Ed's electricity.
8 We rolled back the prices of power.

9 Since that time, Three Mile Island's been down
10 and we've been buying electricity -- "we," not me. I use
11 PP&L, but those people who use Metropolitan Edison as
12 their power source, have been out buying electricity.

13 Have there been any greyouts, brownouts, or
14 other problems? I submit that it seems to me analytically
15 that the energy shortage may be a figment of some industrialist's
16 imagination, hypothetical. I don't know this for a fact.
17 But nobody's lights went out.

18 Nobody's lights have gone out. The plant hasn't
19 been up. We've been buying electricity, and the price is
20 down. Somehow, these things are loose to me. They don't
21 make sense.

22 On the one hand, I need electricity. Maybe we've
23 overproduced it. Maybe we have. But Three Mile Island
24 should remain nonnuclear, if it's possible to clean up the
25 mess, but nonnuclear, and put your confidence, gentlemen,

POOR ORIGINAL

1 in instincts of yourself, not of those who have vested
 2 vital interests like Met Edison. I have no confidence
 3 whatsoever in them.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

7 This concludes this morning's session. We will resume
 8 again at 1:00 p.m.

9 (Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., the hearing was
 10 recessed, to reconvene at 1:00 p.m., this same day.)

11 - - -

12

13

1379 113

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

POOR ORIGINAL AFTERNOON SESSION

(1:02 p.m.)

1
2
3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good afternoon, ladies and
4 gentlemen.

5 This is one of the sessions set aside in the
6 proceeding of the Three Mile Island Unit 1 proceeding for
7 the receipt of statements from members of the public.

8 I am sure that everyone is familiar with the
9 background of this proceeding, but it might be helpful to
10 review it shortly.

11 The Commission has ordered Three Mile Island 1,
12 that's the undamaged unit at Three Mile Island, to remain
13 closed down until a hearing can be conducted. And this
14 Board, the three persons you see on this stage, are the
15 members of the Board designated to preside over those
16 proceedings.

17 To my left is Dr. Linda Little, who is an
18 environmental scientist. That's a traditional position on
19 Atomic Safety and Licensing Boards to have an environmental
20 scientist. She is an Adjunct Associate Professor of
21 Environmental Biology at the University of North Carolina
22 at Chapel Hill. She is also President of her own environ-
23 mental consultant firm, L. W. Little Associates of Raleigh,
24 North Carolina. Dr. Little has written and participates in
25 many professional activities regarding the field of

1 environmental biology, and in particular waste water
2 treatment. She has been a part-time member of the Atomic
3 Safety and Licensing Board Panel since 1974.

4 Dr. Walter Jordan, sitting to my right, is a
5 nuclear physicist. Dr. Jordan is retired as the Assistant
6 Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and he's
7 also retired as a Professor of Nuclear Engineering, the
8 University of Tennessee. He has been a specialist in the
9 field of nuclear safety for many years. He serves as the
10 advisory editor of the Journal of Nuclear Safety. He
11 belongs to several professional societies, and has published
12 in the field of nuclear safety for many years. He's been
13 a part-time member of this panel since 1970.

14 My name is Ivan Smith. I am an attorney. I
15 am a full-time member of the Atomic Safety and Licensing
16 Board Panel. My sole job is to serve as Chairman of
17 Licensing Boards as they preside over hearings of this
18 nature. I am also the Administrative Law Judge and I
19 preside over some proceedings by myself.

20 The Commission has directed that TMI remain
21 closed down until a combination of short-term proposed
22 corrections and long-term proposed corrections have been
23 considered. We are required to address these short-term
24 considerations to determine whether they are sufficient and
25 necessary to protect the health and safety of the public.

POOR ORIGINAL

1 If we find that that is the case and that they
2 will be taken, then we must determine whether longer term
3 actions are sufficient and necessary, and whether reasonable
4 progress has been made toward those.

5 When we can arrive at a decision whether those
6 conditions exist or do not exist, we issue a decision which
7 will then be reviewed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
8 who will then make the ultimate decision in this case.

9 Some of these short-term technical considerations
10 and the long-term ones relate to Babcock & Wilcox reactors
11 in general, and some of them pertain to the situation at
12 Three Mile Island in particular.

13 Some of the issues that we have to consider, I'm
14 sure you're already familiar with, will involve operator
15 training, the effect of waste management at TMI 2 on TMI 1,
16 emergency planning, the financial qualifications of
17 Metropolitan Edison to operate safely TMI Island 1, the
18 managerial and technical competence to operate the plant,
19 and a large series of technical problems which have been
20 addressed in several Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff
21 Reports.

22 In addition to rather usual considerations in
23 nuclear reactors, we also have for the first time in one of
24 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission proceedings an opportunity
25 to address, possibly, the issue of psychological distress as

1 an indirect result of the accident at TMI 2, and the
2 relationship of psychological distress and the operation of
3 TMI 1.

4 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has indicated
5 that after the parties have had an opportunity to brief
6 that subject, that they themselves will make the decision
7 later on whether psychological distress will be a suitable
8 subject for this proceeding.

9 The purpose of the session such as this, the
10 public limited appearance statements, is generally two-fold.

11 One is that we wish to receive information from
12 you. And, on the other hand, we wish to provide information
13 to you, if we're able to do it.

14 This is an adjudicative hearing. We are United
15 States Government judicial officers. The decision we make
16 must be based upon evidence. The statements that you make
17 are not evidence; they are opinions.

18 However, your statements serve a valuable
19 purpose in a hearing such as this, because they can suggest
20 areas to us where the evidentiary trail should lead, and
21 this indeed does happen. Sometimes a member of the public
22 will make a point that may not have been planned to be
23 covered in the evidentiary proceeding. So this is quite
24 helpful.

25 Of course another value is that it gives the

1 members of the public an opportunity to remind the Board and
2 all of the participants of the seriousness of our
3 responsibilities. And we have been reminded about this
4 quite consistently, and this is an appropriate thing and
5 we wish to be reminded.

6 As I understand it, there are now six persons
7 who have indicated that they wish to make a limited
8 appearance statement --

9 VOICE: Now it's seven.

10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right, thank you. There
11 were, some time ago. We have found that -- we announced in
12 the notice that a five-minute limit may have to be placed.
13 We will start out, if anybody has a need to exceed five
14 minutes, I think that conservatively you should do that, if
15 you have to do that to get your story off. But we have
16 found that five minutes has usually been adequate, and many
17 people have been unable to occupy five minutes.

18 We will begin with asking that you limit
19 statement more or less to five minutes. If you have a
20 specific point which will exceed that time, make it and we'll
21 see what happens.

22 You may recommend questions which should be
23 answered by the staff or the licensee in the course of this
24 hearing, and you may also recommend to us areas in which
25 we should inquire as to the evidence.

1 We are taking members of the public in the order
2 in which they have signed up. We have two chairs at the
3 front of the audience section. The persons who follow the
4 speaker of the moment are invited to sit in those chairs
5 so that they'll be ready to begin speaking immediately.

6 The first speaker is Marian Harlan. She will
7 be followed by Jerry Kissell and Al Manik.

8 Ms. Harlan?

9 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF MARIAN HARLAN,
10 HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA.

11 MS. HARLAN: May I ask you two very brief
12 questions before I begin my statement?

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes.

14 MS. HARLAN: They will require just very brief
15 answers.

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Surely.

17 MS. HARLAN: You mentioned that two of you are
18 part-time members of the Committee. Are there any other
19 committees who will be assisting in your deliberations
20 who are not present at these hearings?

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm not quite sure what you
22 mean. The NRC Staff whose counsel is seated at this
23 table (indicating) are parties to the proceeding. Are you
24 referring to --

25 MS. HARLAN: Your particular Ator Safety and

1 Licensing Board, are there other members of that Board who
2 will be helping you to arrive at a decision --

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: No.

4 MS. HARLAN: -- who are not here at this hearing?

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: No. The three members, and
6 three members only.

7 MS. HARLAN: All right --

8 CHAIRMAN SMITH: And we were named by name by
9 the Commissioners in the Notice and Order of Hearing to
0 conduct this hearing.

1 MS. HARLAN: Thank you.

2 One other brief question. In the legal proceedings
3 or the evidentiary hearings which are to follow these
4 hearings, will the public be allowed to participate for the
5 purposes of monitoring those hearings?

6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, yes. Yes, we will try to
7 select hearing space which will make seating space
8 available for as many members of the public as wish to
9 appear, for monitoring. Members of the public will not
0 have an opportunity to participate in the proceeding, except
1 where they have already qualified as intervenors.

2 MS. HARLAN: Thank you.

3 It is my intention to address myself to your
4 description of your task in these hearings and the scope of
5 the matters with which you are to be concerned. This does

1 not mean that I don't have other concern, but I will limit
2 my remarks to those which I think are appropriate to this
3 hearing.

4 You are not here to conduct another investigation
5 into the events surrounding the accident at TMI Unit 2.
6 Good. There are already enough of these underway.

7 You state that you are to make a judgment
8 regarding the safety of the reopening of Unit 1. Will it
9 be a responsible judgment if you should so decide to put
10 another reactor into service before all the investigations
11 into the accident at Unit 2 are completed?

12 And in this regard, I refer you to a newspaper
13 article that appeared in our local paper just last evening
14 which states that the Lessons Learned Task Force made up
15 of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's scientists and
16 engineers recommended Wednesday that the NRC Commission
17 begin considering meltdown possibility in its power plant
18 licensing specifications, because the TMI accident exceeded
19 many of the present design bases and was a significant
20 precursor of a core-melt accident. The NRC should alter
21 its licensing requirements, the Task Force found.

22 Apparently your own Commission has not completed
23 its investigations yet, or finished making recommendations.

24 I also ask you: Is it responsible to create the
25 potential for another traumatic experience for the residents

1 of this area by activating Unit 1 on the very same site as
2 Unit 2 before the edicts and the debris of the previous
3 accident be cleaned up. Because the Unit 2 accident has
4 been described as an unanticipated and unplanned for event,
5 it follows that the cleanup techniques were also unplanned
6 for.

7 Is it not a fact that some of the techniques
8 being used and being considered for use are experimental and
9 untested and have been and still may be revised as the
10 cleanup proceeds?

11 Is it not reasonable of us to ask that you
12 successfully complete this task before you require of us
13 to rely on your ability to cope with any future problems
14 which may arise?

15 The Nation's current so-called safe storage
16 facilities for the radioactive waste have been closed by
17 the states within whose borders they lie. Not only must
18 we contend with the safe disposal of such wastes from the
19 nuclear power plants now operating in the United States,
20 but also with that generated by medical uses and the nuclear
21 weapons system.

22 Why should we continue to add to this growing
23 pile of environmental contaminants until we can get rid of
24 what we have already accumulated?

25 Dr. Edward Teller, whose expertise in the nuclear

1 Teller was considered unquestionable at least until last
2 July 1967, in the Wall Street Journal appeared to answer
3 some questions which I assume were posed and answered by
4 him.

5 In response to the query: Is it true that we
6 still have no satisfactory way to dispose of nuclear waste?
7 Dr. Teller replies, "No. Ways do exist. What we do not
8 have is a decision by our government on which way to go.
9 Waste disposal is a political problem, not a technical
0 problem."

1 If there is a safe way to dispose of nuclear
2 waste as Dr. Teller claims, it is the best-kept secret in
3 this country, and a crime against society to not disclose
4 it. It is interesting to learn that Dr. Teller is described
5 as a leader in the earliest efforts to ensure the safety
6 of nuclear power reactors, and to achieve clean power
7 generation, and yet he has not told us of his method to
8 ensure our safety from the effects of radioactive nuclear
9 waste.

10 You say it is not within the scope of your
11 hearings to decide the future of the nuclear power industry
12 in this country. However, you must realize that Three Mile
13 Island is not an island in regards to this issue, if you
14 will forgive the pun.

15 What happened here last March had a profound

1 effect on the nuclear power industry and so will any decisions
2 you make concerning the question before you. Even the manner
3 in which you do or do not weigh the testimony of the public
4 will influence the country's ultimate decisions relating to
5 nuclear power.

6 We have been told that, given the present
7 conditions in the energy supply of this Nation, we cannot
8 do without the 13 to 15 percent of our power supplied by
9 nuclear power plants.

10 Our ancestors were told that the South could
11 not survive without slavery; that the Titanic could not sink.
12 We ourselves were told that an accident such as occurred at
13 TMI Unit 2 could not happen. Need I say anything about
14 the credibility of such assurances past and present?

15 Additionally, you have stated that you are
16 conducting these hearings to ascertain that all measures
17 will be taken to ensure the public's health and safety in
18 the event of the reopening of the TMI Unit 1. You and the
19 NRC that you represent are the very same people who were
20 entrusted to look after our health and safety before the
21 Unit 2 accident.

22 You gave us assurances then, and you give
23 us assurances now that our interests will be protected.
24 Were they then? And are they now being given the number one
25 priority that we think they deserve?

POOR ORIGINAL

1 We think not. Because we have never been given
2 the opportunity to choose anyone from this area to serve
3 on the various investigative and regulatory bodies looking
4 into these matters of concern and making decisions on our
5 behalf.

6 For years we were not given access to information
7 on which to base an intelligent opinion in regards to the
8 use of nuclear power. We were permitted to know only what
9 the government and industry wanted us to know, and we were
10 told that the whole thing was perfectly safe because the
11 best brains in the country were in charge of the program.

12 Perhaps it is time for a little less brainpower
13 and a little more heart. It bothers me greatly that the
14 very same people from the NRC and Met Ed responsible for
15 presenting a TMI Unit 2 accident are still in charge of
16 the cleanup operations at TMI, and in the case of the NRC
17 of the entire nuclear power program in this country.

18 Such incompetent performance of duty would have
19 been rewarded in any other business with immediate dismissal.
20 Would you have confidence in a company who couldn't
21 recognize the seriousness of an accident that had occurred,
22 or in supervisors who admitted that they were like blind
23 men groping in the dark?

24 I have not been able to find that one single
25 person who was in a position to make any decisions or

1 policies in regards to the continued licensing and operation
2 by Mr. Ed of the TMI facilities is even a part-time resident
3 of this area. Who is to speak for us, if not we ourselves?

4 The evidence thus far accumulated indicates that
5 it was more a matter of luck than a sound design, backup
6 system, skill, and managerial capability which prevented
7 the occurrence of a more serious consequence from the Unit 2
8 accident.

9 Given the proliferation of these plants across
0 the country, it is but by the Grace of God that this accident
1 did not occur in one of your own backyards.

2 Now the NRC has determined -- not we -- that you
3 and not we will decide this matter of utmost concern in our
4 lives. We have also been told that you may or may not
5 consider our testimony in making your decisions, especially
6 in regards to the mental stress issue.

7 Have you any conception of what it does to the
8 human spirit to be told that it is really irrelevant whether
9 or not one has any feelings of concern, or fear, or anger
10 because the decisions to be made in the public interest must
11 be based on larger political and economic considerations?

12 We the public -- We are the public in whose
13 interest such governmental decisions are supposed to be made.
14 We are the current and the future generations of this
15 country's citizens who must live with the decisions that you

1 make. Do not ignore our voices or our pleas for a saner
2 way to live.

3 How can you honestly assure us that those
4 involved have detected and corrected all the design defects
5 and the operator training errors, devised equitable and
6 sufficient funding capabilities, and pursued all the
7 possible avenues for the safe operation of Unit 1?

8 Less than 8 months ago we had your assurance
9 that such an event as occurred could not happen. Now you
10 ask us to believe that the same company in worse financial
11 condition than before, with no record of reliability or
12 competency, had a rebirth, and such an acquisition of
13 knowhow, that it is now capable of resuming the same business
14 at the same site with the same work force and under the
15 same supervision?

16 end JWB-6

17 LRW 7 fols

1379 127

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1rw7-1

Such an assumption is an insult to our intelligence. Do not give us meaningless reassurances. Do not give us -- do not even offer us proof of your concern or capability to protect our interest. For there is no such guarantee which will erase the proof of your past performance. There is, in Pennsylvania --

CHAIRMAN SMITH: How long do you intend --

MS. HARLAN: One final -- two sentences.

There is a Pennsylvania Dutch thing in this part of the country which is imprinted on all sorts of souvenirs available to tourists who visit the area. In essence, it says we grow too soon old and too late smart. I hope and pray that this will not be true of our nation and, indeed, of our world in regards to the use of nuclear technology.

Thank you for the privilege of addressing these remarks to you for your consideration and your deliberations.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Miss Harlan, we have listened to now perhaps close to 100 people and sometimes we have asked questions for clarification. I never yet thought it was necessary to challenge a statement but you have, in your statements, used "you" in a very confused way. Sometimes you refer to the Commission; sometimes you refer to Met Ed; sometimes you refer to us. But, to the extent I thought you referred to us, you have made many, many absolute mis-statements of fact.

MS. HARLAN: Are you not the licensing board?

lrw7-2

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, and I will give you an example.
2 Ma'am, let me give you an example of a mis-statement of fact
3 that you made.

4 We have not told you or anyone that issues of psych-
5 ological distress are irrelevant and it is solely an economic
6 issue. To the contrary, we have told the parties the opposite.

7 MS. HARLAN: You mentioned before every session of
8 these hearings that the NRC had not yet made a decision on
9 whether such issues will be considered.

10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: That is not what you said.

11 MS. HARLAN: I said you may or may not.

12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The transcript will show what you
13 said. I just could not allow it to pass. You have made
14 several statements which simply are not accurate.

15 MS. HARLAN: Can you tell me for sure it will be
16 considered?

17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, Ma'am. I am not going to
18 debate the issues. I just cannot let it pass.

19 Mr. Kissel.

20 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF JERRY KISSEL

21 MR. KISSEL: Thank you.

22 If I may, I would like to comment also on some of
23 the statements from the past speaker and some of the brief --

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I would appreciate, ladies and
25 gentlemen -- we do wish to hear, and that's why we are here

lrw7-3

and will stay as long as it is necessary, to hear what everyone wants to say, but precision is important. If you want to direct your remarks to us, be precise. We would try to ask, if you are addressing industry in general, or the NRC in general, that's one thing, but if you are addressing your remarks to us, we will try to respond if it is precise.

MR. KISSEL: All right.

On the subject of mental health, which I heard mentioned quite a bit here so far, I would like to suggest that the field is very broad. We can talk about mental health of others who are electricity consumers and think about what the alternatives are to TMI. Personally, I don't like the idea of coal-fired electricity putting things into the air which, in many cases, no one really knows what the end results would be.

Some of the fine particles, there is research just getting into this area about the things we are breathing from coal-fired electricity and oil-fired electricity. There are other aspects of mental health. Nuclear can be a positive thing and I would like to see all my electricity generated from it and have cleaner air.

My other remarks, something I would like you to consider, there are some unique elements of TMI 1. The mental health of the people of this area, or the financial situation of GPU, but basically that plant is one of many plants of the same vintage. It was ordered in 1966 and went into service in

POOR ORIGINAL

1196

lrw7-84

1 1974. I am referring to TMI 1. Looking at an NRC booklet
2 about other similar plants, I find quite a few other ones such
3 as Duke Power's Oconee Station which order was around the same
4 time; it is the same size range, B&W reactor, went into service
5 around the same time.

6 There are others. Arkansas Nuclear 1. Rancho Seco.
7 All of these plants are in the 8-900 megawatt range B&W
8 reactors. I might have missed some. These plants are still
9 running, to the best of my knowledge. They took advantage of
10 the lessons learned from TMI. To discriminate against TMI 1
11 and the customers of Met Ed financially and in the air
12 pollution sense that I mentioned looks to be unwarranted dis-
13 crimination.

14 It is hard to see how there is that much difference
15 about this plant that would require such extensive public
16 hearings. My facts may not be correct but I did see some
17 articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal
18 which mentioned a year and a half of public hearings related
19 to the restart of TMI 1. Is that correct?

20 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am not familiar with the articles
21 you have seen but I would not doubt they may have appeared.

22 MR. KISSEL: I could refer to it here by date if you
23 would like.

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't care, really, what the
25 articles say. We are controlling the time of the hearing, at

1379 131

lrw7-5

1 any rate. We know more about it than they do.

2 MR. KISSEL: Additional hearings or other hearings,
3 but, essentially, it looks like the total hearing process --

4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The way the scheduling is going, it
5 will not be possible, it seems to me, for a decision by this
6 board and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission before September
7 1980 and the procedure began in August of 1979, so that puts
8 you somewhere in the ballpark.

9 MR. KISSEL: Well, my point here is --

10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: That, counsel for licensee, I wish
11 to assure you is an effort to inform the public and allow him
12 to understand what is involved. I am not setting any schedule.

13 MR. KISSEL: Well, in other technical matters which
14 also have political overtones, such as the DC-10 story, and
15 one can look at how fast the DC-10s got back in the air, the
16 time for a decision-making process seems inordinately long in
17 this case. Again, I don't know what the exact time will be.
18 We are all a part of the political process just by being here.
19 I think you have some obligation to us, as the board, to do
20 what you can to influence this political process and hasten
21 that. Just by the fact that we are here, we are part of this
22 process and you have an obligation there, I believe.

23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, sir, we are sensitive to that
24 obligation. Thank you.

25 Mr. Manik.

1379 132

lrw7-6

LIMITED APPEARANCE OF AL MANIK

2 MR. MANIK: It is a long time since the accident
3 happened on Three Mile Island. It seems the NRC has been in
4 town as long as the Met Ed Utility Company. It seems that
5 millions of words have been spoken and printed on the accident
6 on Three Mile Island but the best that can be said for the
7 accident was that one valve had to be changed and that makes
8 Plant No. 1 in perfect working order to begin operation again.

9 Let's expand on this problem and see why it should
10 not be in operation. Biggest reason you cannot begin operation
11 on TMI is because of us people. We will not let it in opera-
12 tion and I will explain why.

13 Before you got into the operation, there was a con-
14 cern about insurance. We want the same option as flood
15 insurance. Nothing more or nothing less. We also want an
16 option on our lives. If you think your plant is important, we
17 think our lives are more important.

18 Who will do the evacuating? How will evacuation be
19 carried out? Where are the evacuation plans? All we ever
20 received on this was a lot of hot air. Even a member of the
21 Presidential Commission made a statement that an evacuation
22 was impossible. What would happen to an evacuation in bad
23 weather, or don't nuclear accidents happen in bad weather?
24 What would happen to the aged, the sick that cannot be moved,
25 the people who have no electricity, no radio, no newspapers?

POOR ORIGINAL

1199

1197-1

1 How will they be moved? What will happen to their animals?
2 This is their livelihood. Will the NRC, Met Ed and the rest
3 of the utilities deprive these people of a living? You better
4 believe it!

5 I'm sure that the NRC members on the staff do not
6 want to lose their lucrative positions on the government payroll
7 and these people really work hard. Would you sacrifice these
8 people for a nuclear plant? What about the people who refuse
9 to leave? You cannot order a person out from their property.
10 Are you going to sacrifice these people also because of some-
11 body's negligence in design, operation or for some other
12 reason?

13 Would you get the ambulances to carry out this
14 mission? Where? Where would you get the drivers to move the
15 people requiring help? What about protective clothing for
16 somebody who performs evacuation work, whether it be the good
17 fine fire companies of the town, the good local police or
18 National Guard? How do you intend to protect these people?

19 What have you done to place monitors in the area of
20 concern? What good will they be when you fail to show read-
21 ings from the accident on March 28?

22 We had a gas rationing a short while back. If there
23 was an evacuation and I had no gas, or broke down in the
24 middle of traffic, how would I get out? If I were at work
25 and my wife does not drive a car, how would I get her out of

1379 134

POOR ORIGINAL

1200

lrw7-8

1 the area of concern? You mean to say your utility is worth
2 more than my wife and family? Is your wife and family worth
3 less than your job or a broken down utility plant?

4 What about the people that may have metallic taste
5 in their mouth? Will they die of cancer? What about the
6 pregnant women that either lost their babies, or the babies
7 that were born in less than a healthy condition? Are they
8 second class citizens and your reactors are first class citi-
9 zens, as you would make us believe?

10 Now say you evacuate the area with some success.
11 Where do I go? What area? What about toilet facilities?
12 Bath facilities? Health facilities? Will they be available?
13 One area that was mentioned was a race track in Wilkes Barre.
14 Wouldn't it be nice sleeping in the scraw with the horses?
15 Maybe you would like to bet \$2 on Big Al in the seventh race.
16 That's me. At least, the horses would keep me warm. However,
17 I don't know if I could stand the smell any more.

18 What about the school children with their teachers?
19 How would you get them out of here? Where would you bus
20 these future citizens? To what area? Would the NRC, Met Ed
21 or any other organization take care of these people?

22 What about the stories that came out from the Met
23 Ed people? The stories from NRC. You have heard them over
24 and over again. You know what has been said. You know what
25 has been said and not said because you are the very people who

1379 135

POOR ORIGINAL

1201

lrw7-9

1 said them. We didn't take these up. You said all this to us
2 people.

3 Now call us what you wish, we fear for our lives
4 with nuclear plants. Since you built and operate these plants,
5 you force us to fear even more. This monster has disrupted
6 just many, many people's lives and homes; more than you care
7 to admit. You disrupted my own home and we are in fear of our
8 health. My wife was one that tasted metal. What is it?
9 What will it do?

10 Would you people on the NRC panel enjoy living this
11 way? Who put the trauma in our lives? Do NRC and Met Ed have
12 anything to do with the problems mentioned above? Who really
13 cares if we people do not care? Does NRC care? Do the Met
14 Ed people care?

15 We presented our side of this disaster on the 17th of
16 October. The Met Ed people found time to photograph and tape
17 record every word that was said. The governing NRC body made
18 no effort to stop this type of harrassment. At least, not
19 until the people challenged the utilities. Is that what is
20 commonly called a government of the people, by the people, and
21 for the people? Or is this the right to live in peace without
22 fear, or fear, itself?

23 Isn't it great to be evicted from our homes, our lands,
24 by a nuclear reactor? You wonder about our traumas? You
25 caused us these traumas. You caused us this fear. You were

1379 136

POOR ORIGINAL

1202

lrw7-10

1 the very, very people who made us suffer. Now you want to
2 open up TMI 1 because you changed one little valve. Not
3 correct. You changed the lives of thousands of friends and
4 neighbors.

5
6 To sum it all up, there will be no more nukes,
7 no more fears, no more problems from TMI. The young, the old,
8 the healthy, the sick, have a right to life without any of
9 your fears, threats, meddling, radiation, contamination or
10 anything else the NRC or the utilities have to offer.

11 Thank you.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
END47

1379 137

POOR ORIGINAL

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Could you, sir, explain what you
2 meant by the metallic taste?
3 MR. MANIK: You haven't heard of it before?
4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Could you give us an explanation
5 what you meant by the metallic taste?
6 MR. MANIK: I'll give it to you as it was presented
7 to me.
8 My wife was at work -- if I may take a few minutes --
9 my wife was at work. She works about two miles on the other
10 side of town. It was a nice day. Her and another woman
11 walked home from work. She came home and she says, "Al," she
12 says, "I taste metal in my mouth."
13 I said, "Well, I guess they spiked your coffee or
14 something at work."
15 She said, "No," she said, "I taste metal."
16 I said, "Aw, get out of here. Whoever heard of you
17 tasting metal."
18 So this went on for a while and other people have
19 told me the same thing, and now I would like to know what it is.
20 I think we have three people up here that are well versed in
21 this field. I'm sure somebody has some kind of answer,
22 something that they could tell me about.
23 I've heard people from -- I've heard doctors tell
24 me from Hershey Medical Hospital that it was iodine. Is this
25 correct?

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's exactly why we've asked
2 you about it, so that the answer can be produced. We
3 certainly have no answer, sir. What day was this?

4 MR. MANIK: Tuesday afternoon. The 28th was on a
5 Tuesday -- I'm a little confused.

6 DR. JORDAN: Was it following the day of the
7 accident?

8 MR. MANIK: Yes.

9 DR. JORDAN: That's all we need to know.

10 Thank you, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think somebody will try to give
12 you an answer to it. We have an interest in it, and usually
13 when we express an interest, somebody comes forward with an
14 answer, and I hope that you get it.

15 MR. MANIK: Well, it's not a story. I said the
16 reason we are here is because our lives are disrupted.

17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, sir.

18 MR. MANIK: These people disrupted them, you helped
19 them to disrupt them, and we are here.

20 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Lehman.

21 [Applause.]

22 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF JACK LEHMAN.

23 MR. LEHMAN: Thank you very much.

24 Am I being heard?

25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes.

POOR ORIGINAL

1 MR. LEHMAN: I was under the impression -- just to
2 hitchhike on his comment -- I was under the impression that
3 the metallic taste was an indication that perhaps you had
4 been exposed to radiation. I thought that was common knowledge.
5 Perhaps I've been misinformed.

6 I do not have a prepared statement. As a matter
7 of fact, I, like many thousands of people, was inconvenienced
8 that March 28th, and we did feel it in the best interest to
9 perhaps leave the Harrisburg area, and we wound up in Jersey,
10 and of course we had some additional expense and so on.

11 However, by now, all that inconvenience is dissipated
12 and if it were just the inconvenience, I don't think I'd even
13 be here, because it's a thought behind me now.

14 I am here perhaps predicated more on emotion and a
15 concern for some nice grandchildren that we have. My
16 daughter was here this morning, and I suspect that you may
17 remember Mrs. Kinney, who talked about the fact that she
18 had spent all kinds of money and did everything to protect
19 the children's health. Those are my grandchildren that she was
20 talking about.

21 I have an all-electric home, and I frankly must
22 tell you that I have a selfish motive for being here. I could
23 care less about the economic ramifications if they close TMI.
24 I could care less about profit and loss statements. I just
25 refuse to equate the potential danger to my grandchildren over

POOR ORIGINAL

1 anything else, and I say potential danger because we really
2 still don't know, and I will concede to that, but I just refuse
3 to take that risk. Even if it's remote, I just refuse to take
4 that risk on behalf of my grandchildren.

5 I don't like the fact that my daughter and son-in-law,
6 that their thoughts are predominated with this concern about
7 the fact that their children's lives may end prematurely. So
8 I merely came down today to tell you that I would be willing
9 to sacrifice my all-electric home and light by candle and
0 cook by stone, or whatever would be necessary, to reduce the
1 risk to them.

2 And I merely wanted to go on record as being
3 violently opposed on purely emotional reaction to it ever
4 opening again.

5 And I thank you very much.

6 [Applause.]

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think Jane Gray is next.

8 Thank you.

9 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF JANE GRAY.

10 MS. GRAY: My name is Jane Gray, and I am a
11 resident of this area. I work at the Hershey Medical Center,
12 and the weekend of the accident I remained somewhat on call
13 to assist, if an evacuation was necessary.

14 I am here once again, since I have appeared before
15 every NRC and President's Commission hearing in this area,

POOR ORIGINAL

1 to voice my objections to any operation of the nuclear facility
2 in this area by this company, its parent company, or any of
3 its parent subsidiary companies.

4 The accident at TMI clearly showed the complete
5 lack of concern for the people of this area felt by Met Ed and
6 GPU.

7 I am not a wealthy or an influential person, but
8 this company endangered my life and my home, and I will do
9 whatever I can to prevent them from having that opportunity
10 again.

11 I do not object to nuclear energy, per se, although
12 its dangers really seem very large now, and given our situation
13 in the world of energy producers, such as Iran, all sources
14 of energy must be utilized as much as possible. But this
15 should not be done recklessly and herein lies my chief objec-
16 tion to the restarting of Unit 1 by Met Ed or GPU.

17 If TMI is to be reopened by any company or agency,
18 I feel it should be done by a group with a better safety record
19 and a much higher level of concern for the public's good than
20 these people have shown us heretofore.

21 I won't use up the rest of my five minutes.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Ms. Gray.

23 [Applause.]

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, sir.

25

POOR ORIGINAL

1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF JOHN J.

2 KOVALIC.

3 MR. KOVALIC: I am not prepared, I don't have
4 any written statement, but I'd like to make a statement based
5 on just the way I feel, as the man said, just on emotion.

6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: You're Mr. Kovalic?

7 MR. KOVALIC: John Kovalic, yes.

8 I feel that when the Three Mile Island Plant was
9 built here in the Middletown area, it imposed on the people in
10 the area the total investment of Three Mile Island; as opposed
11 to the investment of homes, lives and health of the people in
12 the area, it's infinitesimal.

13 There's a lot of concern here publicly about the
14 investment of GPU and Met Ed. That's a drop in the bucket
15 compared to the dollar and cents value of the homes alone,
16 and the dollars and cents values, if you ever could place it,
17 on lives alone.

18 And there has been a lack of concern about the
19 site of the area, because I know this country prides itself
20 on its compassion for human rights and people in other lands.
21 It seems to me they would put a greater emphasis on the
22 people in Cambodia and boat people, and I guess for show
23 somewhat, and somewhat for maybe real compassion.

24 But this country has shown a great lack of disregard
25 for human considerations in this country itself, and in the

POOR ORIGINAL

1 Three mile area constantly you can see the paradings in the
2 public eye, the public pronouncements of EPICOR II will resolve
3 this and that.

4 To me, it's nothing but a boiling water process.
5 You cannot get the trytium, or tritium, or whatever it is,
6 in that water. It is still a storage problem. The release
7 of krypton gas that's proposed. It is just another example of
8 what they want to do is to have the human population absorb
9 and dissipate the radioactive waste.

10 And to me, the solution of radioactive waste is
11 still -- the school is out on that. The low level radiation
12 that comes out of these plants constantly.

13 The same thing with low level radiation dumpings
14 into the river. There are valid records of some of the things
15 that have happened at Three Mile Island for a period of years
16 before March 28th, where they have dumped water, radioactive
17 water into the river. There have been emissions from the
18 plant that somebody had to be subjected to. If it doesn't
19 disperse properly, depending on where the wind is going,
20 someone is going to get more than his share of exposure, and
21 I don't think anyone really cares too much about that, and
22 I don't think we should wait for someone from Met Ed or the
23 NRC to say, hey, there's a nuclear accident.

24 I think there should be an automatic dispensing
25 device, red smoke, something, all over the community for people

1 here to say, here, the radioactive meter has just generated
2 a reading so high, run for your life.

3 There isn't anything like that. You can't wait a
4 day, you can't wait an hour, you've got to run like hell
5 when you are in a radioactive condition, because the first
6 shot is your last shot, and the whole Susquehanna River area
7 is becoming a nuclear sewer because between the politicians
8 and the big business operators, they are putting plants up and
9 down this whole river without regard to the cumulative effect
10 of all these plants discharging so-called minimal amounts of
11 radiation. Minimal to who?

12 The effects of low level radiation are still not
13 fully analyzed, but there is evidence enough to know that
14 background radiation causes "X" number of cancers and an
15 increase of background radiation brings up the cumulative
16 total that affects more and more of us all the time.

17 The total exposure we got on March 28th, and they
18 said the worst day was Thursday before that Friday -- I don't
19 know which is the date -- 27th of March -- for some reason
20 or other no one can identify exactly what we are subjected
21 to, and this is to me, I think, there is always -- you wonder
22 can it be that no one really knows? Is somebody hiding
23 something?

24 The statement that was made by the Nuclear
25 Accident on Three Mile Island Commission that no one was

1 killed, you could draw the analogy that if someone shot at
2 you and missed and wounded you, no crime was committed.

3 The fact of the matter is we have all been wounded,
4 we are all worrying about our property, we are all worrying
5 about our health. We all worry about our grandchildren.

6 The other thing is that the nuclear plants in this
7 area, I'm pretty sure if somebody would give a fair analysis
8 of why they are built in this area, it's usually because of
9 lack of protest generally by the people in the area. They're
0 generally regarded as passive, and therefore you can build it
1 and get away with it.

2 Nuclear plants, TMI generates probably a great
3 proportion of its energy for New Jersey, but we will suffer the
4 consequences of that.

5 In conclusion, I'd like to say that TMI should be
6 closed. It is physically too close to a population area, and
7 should have never -- it was misplaced, in the first place,
8 and there's no such thing as not being able to simply keep it
9 closed, and if they had a new standard for nuclear energy, it
0 should be at least 10, 20 miles from a residential area.

21 [Applause.]

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The next speaker is Brynn Schmitt,
23 followed by Allen Krøhler, then Jean Ewing.

1 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF BRYNN SCHMITT.

2 MS. SCHMITT: I would just like to make a brief
3 statement on behalf of my family, particularly my one and a
4 half year old son, and my husband, but also for my mother
5 and brothers and sisters who couldn't be here today.

6 I would like to express a strong opposition to the
7 opening of Unit 1 at Three Mile Island. We can see no reason
8 why we and all our neighbors should ever again have to face
9 the risk of being subjected to the kind of terror, confusion
0 and disruption of our lives that was caused by the accident
11 which began last March 28th.

12 Our whole quality of life has been severely and
13 adversely affected by that event. We lived in the city of
14 Lancaster until just a week or so ago, and so all of our
15 water came from the Susquehanna River, from the intake located
16 just a few miles below the power plant.

17 Ever since the accident on March 28th, I have been
18 afraid to drink or cook with that water. I didn't even feel
19 good about bathing my child in it for fear that at any given
20 time it might contain radioactive isotopes released accidentally
21 or otherwise from Three Mile Island.

22 My distrust of the water was definitely one factor
23 in our decision to leave the city. At this point we are
24 still trying to decide whether to leave southern Pennsylvania
25 completely for an area where we would be at least 75 miles from

1 the nearest nuclear facility.

2 To me it seems outrageous and unconstitutional
3 that we, the people, of this state should be victimized by
4 the threat of accidents like Three Mile Island or worse.

5 I think that the threat of the type of devastation
6 that would occur in a major accident certainly endangers our
7 constitutional right to the pursuit of life, liberty and
8 happiness.

9 Even the so-called low level radiation, which is
10 routinely released, is bound to increase the number of deaths
11 by cancer and leukemia, especially in children.

12 Since the accident I have had to struggle with
13 fears that my son might turn out to be one of the ugly
14 statistics which some doctors and scientists predict will be
15 the eventual result of the unknown amounts of radiation to
16 which we were all exposed in March and April.

17 As a mother, I am willing to do anything in my
18 power to fight for the right of my child to the chance for a
19 safe and healthy future. We do not want our children's lives
20 threatened any further by this nuclear madness.

21 Thank you very much for giving me the chance to
22 speak.

23 [Applause.]

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Kroehler.

25 Following Mr. Kroehler will be Jean Ewing, and I'd

1 appreciate it if you would be prepared to follow the speaker.

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF ALLEN KROEHLER.

3 MR. KROEHLER: Mr. Smith, my name is Allen
4 Kroehler. I am an ordained pastor in the United Church of
5 Christ and teach at the Lancaster Theological Seminary in
6 Lancaster. But I am not here primarily in this role,
7 because the woman you just heard is my daughter, and the child
8 who is disrupting your hearings is my grandson.

9 And I am motivated, as the other persons here are,
10 by our concern about the future of our children and their
11 children.

12 But since the accident at TMI I have been involved
13 in trying to help to educate the public about the concerns,
14 organizing, attending and leading rallies. I just on October
15 28th and 29th attended the rally in Washington, called
16 "No More Nuclear Victims."

17 We visited the Department of Energy and successfully
18 closed the doors of that building for the afternoon to get
19 their attention, and to talk to them and express our concerns
20 to them.

21 Incidentally, that got very little press coverage
22 around the country, just in Washington, and it seems that
23 that is part of what we feel powerless about, that even though
24 we have the opportunity to speak to you today and have to
25 stand on our heads, we're having demonstrations and rallies

1 to try to get the attention of the government.

2 Many times the message of the people isn't heard,
3 and so I hope that even though you hear us giving emotional
4 and confused, and sometimes misinformed statements, you are
5 also hearing the emotion and the feelings that people are
6 trying to express here.

7 There are a number of concerns, I guess, that I
8 have become aware of, but some may have been mentioned already
9 that might be ones you would want to check into, and one --
0 some are in relationship to evacuation.

11 The seminary where I teach was asked to be an
12 evacuation center and we, of course, responded affirmatively,
13 but we're so close to TMI, that that seemed almost ridiculous
14 at the time.

15 But the church with which I am connected, we were
16 also asked to contact other churches farther away from
17 Harrisburg, and found several days of frustration of being
18 unable even to contact people by phone because of the tie-ups.

19 So even that well-meaning, well-intentioned efforts
20 on the part of people were frustrated by the breakdown of
21 technology. And there is no reason to suppose that if that
22 happened with a newer accident, that that wouldn't be
23 compounded and made much more difficult and impossible in
24 the event of a really more serious accident.

25 There is also the thing that some people have
mentioned about the nature of this community. The religious

POOR ORIGINAL

1 orientation of many of the people around here, and their
 2 willingness to accept and to receive what government and
 3 people who represent the government say --

4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Excuse me, sir. There may be
 5 high voltages in connection -- is that possible?

6 DR. JORDAN: I don't think so.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right, I guess there's no
 8 problem.

9 DR. JORDAN: He was concerned --

0 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I was worried about the child,
 1 with the wire. I don't know if it's safe. I guess it is safe.
 2 I guess it's all right, sir. I don't think there is any
 3 problem.

4 MR. KROEHLER: Thank you.

5 And I think that what some people have said bears
 6 repeating, that the people around here are willing to do
 7 what needs to be done in the way of adjusting their lifestyles
 8 and to give up the unnecessary luxuries of nuclear-produced
 9 electricity, if they be contacted and talked to about that
 10 and willing to change their lifestyle in favor of human life
 11 and the futures of their children, instead of the motivation
 12 which seems to be making these decisions now.

13 At Washington two weeks ago, an Indian woman
 14 spoke after we had heard some of the other nuclear victims
 15 speak of their frustration of not being able to be heard,

1 not being able to get the government to reimburse them for
2 expenses and to give them any consideration, because their
3 lives had been destroyed by testing and by exposure to radiation.
4 And she said that she wanted to leave with us a statement
5 which had been a part of their tradition for some time.

6 She said they usually made decisions on the basis
7 that whatever they did would not cause harm to anyone for the
8 next seven generations, and that seemed a word of wisdom which
9 all of us could remember.

10 I hope that we will not for the wrong reasons
11 cause harm to succeeding generations.

12 Thank you.

13 [Applause.]

14 end 8

1379 152

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9-1 JWB

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF JEAN EWING,
DARLINGTON, MARYLAND.

MS. EWING: My name is Jean Ewing. I'm with the
Northeast Branch of the International League for Peace and
Freedom. I live over the State line at Darlington, Maryland.

My primary concern recently has been with the
transportation of wastes. I wonder whether the NRC can
consider much safer systems of transportation wastes. I
see trucks that are designed so that they can only handle
a collision with other trucks of this kind.

I see no special evidence of special inspection
of lights, or of suspension systems, or of the brakes of
the trucks that go in and out of the Peach Bottom plant,
which is nearest to me. And I doubt if there is any better
inspection of trucks that are transporting wastes in other
areas, although there may be, and I would like to hear
about them. Do you know about any such things?

CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, ma'am, I don't. No.

MS. EWING: These look like ordinary commercial
carriers to me. I am well aware of the driving speed of
the trucks that are transporting the nuclear waste. I
happen to be able to recognize the nuclear emblem, but
I wanted to protest, too, that the NRC or somebody is not

1 seeing to it that the emblem that goes on these trucks is
2 visible for many more than just say 30 feet or, at the most,
3 a very short distance, two or three car lengths behind the
4 truck. I should think that those letters should be at least
5 six inches high and done in very clear lettering so that
6 they can be seen.

7 I am sure that it's a State Police record, but I
8 would think that it might be also a national problem, that
9 these drivers speed should never exceed the speed limit. I
10 have yet to see a nuclear carrier going at the prescribed
11 driving -- posted driving speed, unless he is following two
12 or three other vehicles that happen to be going that speed,
13 also.

14 Coming from Maryland, I am very concerned about
15 the venting of nuclear wastes. I know that your largest
16 populations are north of TMI and north of Peach Bottom, and
17 that you people who are here this evening (indicating
18 audience) are concerned about the wind direction.

19 I come from Harford and Cecil County and I'm
20 surrounded by farmers who have good beef cattle and who
21 have good dairy herds, and I myself am only fourth generation
22 in that area, and I am distressed to find that real estate
23 values in this area are -- seem to be falling off fairly
24 sharply.

25 Speaking of values of property, I must extend

1 your concepts, if I can try to, to the much wider area than
2 we are thinking of perhaps usually in terms of Three Mile
3 Island.

4 The Susquehanna River supplies 60 percent of
5 the fresh water for the Chesapeake Bay. 60 percent of the
6 fresh water in the Chesapeake comes from the Susquehanna
7 Watershed.

8 This means that the whole seafood industry of
9 Maryland, Virginia, and of the Bay, and perhaps eventually
10 of the ocean is eventually at stake here, and perhaps much
11 sooner than we think.

12 I am talking I think about values that are much,
13 much greater. I am not married. I don't have children,
14 and my concerns are almost secondhand, in that they end in
15 our family with our generation. And yet I think the values
16 of the whole area, and of perhaps the whole planet, are at
17 stake with the consideration of the continuation of this
18 industry.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.

20 (Applause.)

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Beverly Hess, please.

22 Beverly Hess will be followed by Mr. Carrick,
23 then I believe the name is Tate, and then Susan Carty.
24
25

1379 155

LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF BEVERLY HESS

1
2 MS. HESS: Good afternoon. I don't have a
3 prepared statement. I have been in the hope, after having
4 sent my request to speak, that there would be so many people
5 that it wouldn't be necessary for me to talk today, because
6 I did talk before the Kemeny Commission and I gave some
7 evidence before the Bainbridge State Select Committee.

8 The reason that I have come is because I've heard
9 that there have not been the number of citizens here that
10 I would have hoped.

11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We have had a full schedule
12 every session --

13 MS. HESS: I'm glad to hear that.

14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't know. I have no count,
15 but there have been several hundred people here.

16 MS. HESS: I'm glad to hear that.

17 At the time of the accident at Three Mile Island
18 I was acting as convenor of the Religious Education
19 Committee of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Society of
20 Friends. Last October as part of my responsibilities, I
21 had been at a conference called "Teaching the Lessons of
22 the Holocaust." A number of Jewish survivors of the
23 Holocaust in Germany had felt that Americans have not been
24 really aware of the necessity that there is for us to
25 educate ourselves about the whole political process and what

1 goes on in our country.

2 I think that at the time it was an academic
3 discussion for me, the thought that Nazi Germany could be
4 equated with the United States. It didn't seem very real.

5 From the time of the accident at Three Mile Island,
6 I have become emersed in studying about nuclear energy.
7 My feeling is that we have been well advised about the need
8 for nuclear energy, but that the country really has not
9 been educated either by the government, and certainly not
10 by the industry, on what the risks to the people surrounding
11 nuclear plants are. And I have this as a real concern, and
12 I bring it to you: That it should not be up to citizens
13 groups to have to advise their neighbors about what the
14 risks are.

15 What happened in Lancaster County was that a
16 group of us, right after the accident, formed a citizens
17 group which is called the "Susquehanna Valley Alliance."
18 I was one of five people who have been in the leadership
19 of the Alliance. I dropped out of that in September in
20 order to raise funds for the legal suit that we are bringing
21 against the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, against Met Ed,
22 and the various corporate owners.

23 We are now about \$15,000 in debt. This is not
24 something that I am accustomed to being. It's a whole
25 different issue, indebtedness, from the issue of fear for

1 health and safety, but it is very much combined. Because
2 what we charge in our suit against these defendants is
3 violation by the government and the corporate defendants
4 of the National Environmental Policy Act, of the Clean Water
5 Act, of the Atomic Energy Act, and of the Constitution of
6 the United States.

7 It feels very bad for citizens to have to raise
8 the money in the face of what we see being the kinds of
9 money that is available to continue the industry without
10 question.

11 One of the reliefs that we ask for in our
12 legal action is that an environmental impact statement be
13 done. I am grateful that last Friday Chairman Hendrie did
14 say that an environmental impact statement will be done, but
15 I really feel that it's outrageous that it should have taken
16 this amount of time in the face of the kind of accident that
17 there was at reactor 2 for -- I forget the beginning of the
18 sentence.

19 I think that an environmental impact statement
20 clearly should have been stated to have been done in the
21 beginning. This is talking about reactor number 2, and it
22 may not be completely relevant to the relicensing, or the
23 going back on line of reactor number 1, but I believe --
24 well, in my mind it is connected.

25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think it's close enough.

1 MS. NESS: One of the real concerns that we
2 have is that in Lancaster County there's a big concern for
3 cleanliness. I've always felt that I shouldn't live in
4 Lancaster County because I don't have a real desire to be
5 as spick-and-span as most people do. But I think that the
6 term "the cleanup of Three Mile Island," of the accident
7 at Three Mile Island, really is a misnomer that has captured
8 the imagination of a lot of people in Lancaster County.

9 Because what is happening, so far as I know, at
10 Three Mile Island is not a cleanup. EPICORE-2 that is
11 processing that medium-level radioactive water is moving
12 the radioactivity into the resin beds, the resin filters
13 that are being stored on the island. My understanding is
14 that -- because we have a well. We live in the country, and
15 we know that the purifier -- well, I don't imagine that
16 radioactivity could be purified out by ground anyway, but
17 we have a real concern about the leaching of those radio-
18 active wastes into the groundwater from being stored at
19 Three Mile Island.

20 Another concern that I would like to raise for
21 your consideration is a piece called the Zirconium Connection
22 by a man named Daniel Pacelli (phonetic), I believe. He
23 says that although zirconium is the best cladding that the
24 industry, or that physicists know of for containing the
25 nuclear fuels, that there is inherent in zirconium, as there

1 would be in any other cladding, the possibility that when
2 the emergency core cooling system puts water in at a high
3 temperature, that there is inevitably going to be the release
4 of hydrogen free hydrogen in a bubble.

5 So that the thought of the scenario that did
6 happen and what almost happened at Three Mile Island 2
7 taking place before this environmental impact statement is
8 even completed seems so monstrous to me. It does make in
9 my mind the kind of connection that there is where a
10 government decided what was good for the government at the
11 expense of individuals.

12 So I want to add my thought that that's a
13 concern that we all have.

14 I don't have anything further to say. I thought
15 perhaps you were going to ask --

16 (Board conferring.)

17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Would you wait just a moment,
18 please?

19 DR. LITTLE: You referred to the potential
20 contamination of groundwater?

21 MS. HESS: Yes.

22 DR. LITTLE: Do you have any information on
23 that, or any questions to raise about that? That has not
24 been brought up before, I don't believe.

25 MS. HESS: Well, my understanding is that the

1 filters are being stored on Three Mile Island in a pit on
2 the southeast corner of the Island, and that there is a
3 well next to the pit, and that the water from the well is
4 being tested to see that there is no leaching of the
5 radioactivity from the pit into that adjacent well, at
6 least.

7 My knowledge of what happens, well-wise, in
8 Lancaster County, and I would assume in that area, too, is
9 that there are ways that -- they don't go directly, because
10 of the nature of the soil. That might not be responsive
11 to what you asked, but that is my understanding of what the
12 storage is being on the island of the filters.

13 DR. LITTLE: You mentioned about the underlying
14 strata. Does this have something to do with the basic
15 geology of the area, the kind of soil?

16 MS. HESS: Well, my understanding from two
17 geologists, or two people who are on the -- in the Geology
18 Department at Franklin Marshall College, which is in
19 Lancaster, is that there has not been really sufficient
20 work done on the geologic strata. And I would like to know
21 about that.

22 DR. LITTLE: Thank you very much.

23 MS. HESS: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Carrick?

2 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF PAUL CARRICK,
3 HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA.

4 MR. CARRICK: Chairman Smith, members of the
5 Licensing Board, and fellow citizens:

6 Before I tell you why I think that Unit 1 ought
7 not to be permitted to operate at Three Mile Island ever
8 again, I would like to express my gratitude to the Nuclear
9 Regulatory Commission for allowing those of us who live near
10 the nuclear reactor the opportunity to express our views
11 and to be a part of this very important proceeding.

12 Perhaps I should identify myself a little further.
13 I'm a resident of Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, where I reside
14 with my wife and infant son. I am Associate Professor of
15 Philosophy and Humanities at Harrisburg Area Community
16 College, a community college serving 5000 students within
17 the area of Harrisburg, and specifically in and around the
18 Three Mile Island facility.

19 I speak on behalf of many of the students whom I
20 teach, and I speak as a private citizen on behalf of my
21 family and many of my neighbors.

22 There are many different ways that one can look
23 at this question: Should Unit 1 be permitted to go on line
24 once more?

25 Looked at from a narrow economic point of view,

1 Metropolitan Edison Corporation and the General Public
2 Utilities Corporation, the licensee, says, "Yes, definitely.
3 Every day the plant is shut down, profits are lost and
4 shareholders are disappointed. GPU and Met Ed have invested
5 vast sums of money to build the Three Mile Island Nuclear
6 Plant, and they claim every priority should be given to
7 their right to recover a fair profit in return for the
8 enormous investment in capital.

9 Moreover, the licensee is quick to point out
10 that its customers served by TMI, the vast majority of whom
11 do not live within the 50-mile radius of the plant, are
12 inconvenienced and unfairly punished by the continued shut-
13 down of Unit 1.

14 In order to supply its customers with
15 electricity, the licensee must purchase it at higher cost
16 from other sources and now seeks to force customers to
17 pay this higher cost.

18 All this is very sad, I agree. But it is also
19 very one-sided.

20 What is one-sided about it is that the licensee
21 hastens to conclude that, on the assumption that the return
22 to operation of Unit 1 poses no meaningful threat to public
23 health, Met Ed ought to be permitted to make money and
24 generate electricity again there. But there are at least
25 two other sides to this issue which the licensee studiously

ignores or seeks to minimize.

2 One has to do with the dubious assumption that
3 the restart of Unit 1 poses no threat to public health.
4 The other has to do with the moral principle and, if I read
5 the United States Constitution correctly, the Constitutional
6 and legal principle that as private, noncorporate citizens,
7 living in central Pennsylvania, we have the right to life,
8 liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness.

9 That is, we have the right, it seems to me, "we"
10 have the right, guaranteed by the Constitution, to go about
11 our daily business unencumbered by the real or probable
12 threat to our environment posed by this already dangerous,
13 poorly designed, and poorly managed reactor facility.

14 We have the right to continue to reside in this
15 community to breathe unradiated air, and to enjoy with our
16 children the natural beauty of the Susquehanna River, without
17 having to worry that Unit 1 will, like its sister reactor
18 Unit 2 already has, seriously malfunctioned and place our
19 lives, liberty, and property in great danger.

20 Those of us living near Three Mile Island are
21 among the minority of our countrymen. True enough. But
22 we are fortunate to live in a Nation where the rights of
23 political and other minorities are protected by the rule of
24 law.

25 No majority of corporate stockholders, and

1 certainly no single though powerful utility corporation
2 like GPU, can legally violate or legally threaten to violate
3 our right to live in a reasonably safe environment.

4 Because the return to operation of Unit 1 does
5 pose a very real continued threat to our environment,
6 because the return to operation of Unit 1 does impose on
7 myself and my fellow central Pennsylvanians a risk to life,
8 liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness disproportionate
9 to the risks that the average American citizen is asked to
10 endure, I urge the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to keep Unit
11 1 closed, and to keep it closed forever!

12 This I urge not because I and many fellow
13 citizens on behalf of whom I speak want your sympathy. Ours
14 is not an appeal to pity, nor do we wish to here
15 introduce arguments based on psychological considerations,
16 however valid these are.

17 My urging you to keep Unit 1 out of operation is
18 based primarily on legal and ethical considerations.
19 Legally, central Pennsylvanians, a threatened and unfortunate
20 minority giving our geographical location near this country's
21 most infamous and hazardous nuclear power plant, have the
22 constitutional right to live in a safe environment.

23 And if this be admitted, then ethically, since
24 we do have this right, and since turning on Unit 1 poses a
25 treal threat to and violates our constitutional rights, you

1 the members of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, it
2 seems to me, have the accompanying duty -- the duty -- to
3 see that Unit 1 remains out of operation.

4 What I have said so far introduces the moral and
5 legal considerations on which I base my argument, but there
6 are at least two additional related issues that are relevant
7 to the future of Unit 1.

8 The first has to do with public health. The
9 second has to do with the irresponsible conduct of Met Ed
10 in its handling of the March 28th accident, and in its
11 subsequent cleanup operations.

12 The Licensee wishes to ignore or minimize these
13 issues, but as local residents we are outraged and we will
14 take a direct stand against Met Ed's slick public relations
15 subterfuge of the vital issues at stake here.

16 We shall never lose sight of the fact that the
17 same utility that gave us the mess at Unit 2 now wishes to
18 restart Unit 1.

19 On the issue of public health and the safety of
20 our children and our entire families and our friends, if
21 Unit 1 goes into operation, then low levels of radiation
22 will almost certainly be emitted from time to time during
23 the normal operation of the plant.

24 Should the usual minor accidents occur, or
25 another major one of a Class 9 sort as we suffered here last
March, then high levels of radiation would pollute our
environment.

end JWB9

1379 166

lrw-10-1

1 Either way, during normal operations or during
2 transients or, in plain language, accidents, radiation would
3 escape from Unit 1 and this is a very serious public health
4 matter. Are the long term effects of low level radiation
5 known? The answer is no. Scientists are sharply divided on
6 the full consequences of these effects to developed fetuses
7 and to yet unborn future generations.

8 Are the long and short term effects of high level
9 radiation known? Yes, these effects are more widely under-
10 stood. Scientific opinion is almost unanimous here. High
11 level radiation in sufficient doses kills. If this is the
12 case, if this is the case, then I implore you to keep unit 1
13 shut down. It is only prudent and it seems to me the only
14 rational thing to do, it is the only truly responsible action
15 that you can take.

16 I am soon concluding. Also, coming to the issue of
17 corporate responsibility, Met Ed and GPU must be called to
18 task. The safety record of the licensee does not merit our
19 confidence, nor does the demonstrated concern of the licensee
20 for the general health and welfare of area residents. This
21 has been made abundantly clear on at least three occasions to
22 date. During the worst nuclear accident in American history,
23 March 28 and 29, the licensee acted in a deceptive and irre-
24 sponsible manner by withholding from area citizens the fact
25 that radiation readings were so high at the plant that

1379 167

lrw10-2

measuring gauges were off scale.

My pregnant wife drove to within two miles of the plant at Three Mile Island on March 28, not knowing any of this. Incidentally, our infant son was born prematurely in July. I do not, however, allege a link.

In reply, the licensee says it did not then believe what these gauges were reporting, but my point is this: We, as area citizens, had a right to know. We had a right to know how potentially hazardous things were on March 28 and 29. The licensee denied us this important information. That, I submit, is irresponsible corporate conduct and it must be severely punished under the law.

Second, well before the state of emergency was officially over, well before Civil Defense was taken off alert, on March 31, 1979 the vice president for GPU announced to the media that everything was under control; the crisis was over, he said. This was a very premature announcement calculated to promote a better company image. It was at the time a false statement. Some say an out and out lie.

At that time, Mr. Denton of the NRC, then in charge, did not concur with this rosy GPU assessment and, indeed, for several more days the entire nation watched with horror and finally relief as the condition of the plant was gradually brought under more secure and stable control by April 4.

Thirdly, in what the licensee later portrayed as a

lrw10-3

1 communications foul-up, it illegally dumped several hundred
2 gallons of contaminated water into the Susquehanna in May of
3 this year. That, it did without prior announcement to the
4 public on a day when many people downriver were swimming and
5 boating on the river near the Susquehanna Yacht Club, to which
6 I belong.

7 Incredibly enough, earlier this week, Met Ed, through
8 its vice president Mr. Robert Arnold, asks permission of the
9 NRC to vent radioactive contaminant Krypton-85 into our
10 atmosphere shortly after the Christmas holidays. While the
11 licensee wishes to justify this further assault on our lives
12 and property on the grounds that it is the safest solution, I
13 contend that it is merely the most expedient and inexpensive
14 solution. It is the sort of solution that Met Ed is famous
15 for as again it disregards the feelings of most area residents
16 and threatens our freedom of action, as many of us may wish
17 to stay indoors or evacuate during the proposed venting
18 process.

19 This is the same company that seeks to restart Unit
20 1. To sum up, the issue of whether Unit 1 ought to be
21 permitted to operate is not merely a health issue, nor is it,
22 as the licensee would have us think, a matter of simple
23 economic efficiency. It is, first and foremost, a moral
24 issue. It requires a moral decision one based on the moral
25 and legal principle that all citizens, even those living near

1379 169

lrw10-1

1 Three Mile Island, have the right to their lives, their
 2 property, their freedom to pursue happiness within the frame-
 3 work of the United States Constitution.

4 Turning Unit 1 on puts our rights to these things at
 5 unreasonable risk by subjecting us to a threatening and haz-
 6 ardous technology already responsible for great local suffer-
 7 ing and personal economic loss. I urge the members of this
 8 panel to deny the licensee permission to reactivate Unit 1.
 9 May you have the courage to take a firm stand and show those
 10 of us living in Central Pennsylvania that you care; that you
 11 are not, as some have charged, the mere puppets and repre-
 12 sentatives of the utilities you seek to regulate.

13 Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Nancy Tate.

15 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF NANCY TATE

16 MS. TATE: I am Nancy Tate and I live in Freemans-
 17 burg, Pennsylvania. I speak from the context of my work as a
 18 staff person for LEPOCO, Lehigh-Pocono Committee of Concern,
 19 a local citizens group with offices in Bethlehem, Pennsyl-
 20 vania. Much of our time and effort as an organization has
 21 been spent addressing the issue of nuclear power since the
 22 Three Mile Island accident. However, our opposition to this
 23 form of energy production predates the accident as the
 24 attached statement details.

25 Our Lehigh Valley lies between 80 and 90 miles from

1379 170

lrw10-85

1 Three Mile Island and people in our area are also extremely
2 concerned that TMI Unit 1 not be allowed to come back on line
3 as a nuclear generating facility. I submit that you need to
4 consider most seriously in your hearings the consequences of
5 reopening Unit 1 on the people within 30 to 40 miles of TMI,
6 but you also must weigh the consequences for people in much
7 larger concentric circles - at least up to 100 miles and
8 possibly further.

9 First, I want to read the larger part of a statement
10 drafted on April 2, 1979 by 14 LNPOCO members who had evacuated
11 to Virginia following the accident at TMI. We all returned to
12 the Lehigh Valley, Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, at various
13 times between April 3 and April 18.

14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Miss Tate, the reporter isn't
15 complaining but if -- you are speaking very rapidly. If he is
16 catching this, it is a remarkable feat of reporting. You are
17 actually reading from a statement?

18 MS. TATE: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: When you get done with your state-
20 ment, would you provide it to him?

21 MS. TATE: Sure.

22 I will continue where I left off, then.

23 There were more evacuees from our area, especially
24 people with young children, of which I am aware and probably
25 many more I did not know.

1379 171

lrw10-6

1 We are a group of Lehigh Valley residents who, on
2 our own initiative, left Pennsylvania in response to the
3 accident at Three Mile Island. As a group, we have studied
4 the problems of nuclear power for several years, and began
5 monitoring news reports, and filling in informational gaps by
6 calling reliable sources. We conferred with the Union of
7 Concerned Scientists and the Environmental Coalition on Nuc-
8 lear Power among others from the first signs of trouble at
9 Three Mile Island.

10 From early Wednesday A.M., first Met Ed and then the
11 NRC and then state officials had told people that the situa-
12 tion was under control and that there was no danger to anyone,
13 including residents within the five mile radius of the plant.
14 By late Friday, it was abundantly clear to us that these
15 officials were lying, that a media blackout was in effect with
16 regard to certain aspects of the accident, that considerable
17 radiation had already been released in the Middletown area,
18 and that there had been a dangerous possibility of a reactor
19 core meltdown from the first event on Wednesday morning.

20 We believed that an evacuation of the ten to twenty
21 mile radius should have been done on Wednesday. It was also
22 clear that no such order would be given, at the risk of com-
23 pany profits and industry credibility.

24 By Saturday morning we had collectively decided that
25 the only sensible option for us was to put as many miles

lrw10-7

1 between our bodies and Three Mile Island as we could. This
2 was not a decision easily arrived at and was influenced by
3 several factors.

4 One, we felt there was a serious possibility of a
5 meltdown or other massive release of high level radiation
6 potentially devastating a thousand square miles. Based on
7 normal wind patterns and our location within a hundred mile
8 radius of Three Mile Island, we were in danger.

9 There is no safe level of radiation. The levels
10 reported by Met Ed in the Three Mile Island area were not
11 safe, we were convinced. We reasoned that we were not lending
12 this conviction much credibility if we remained in an area that
13 was even remotely threatened by radioactive contamination from
14 potential releases.

15 Two, a most serious consideration was given to the
16 outrageously irresponsible inaction of the company, state and
17 federal officials to inform the public of the state of emer-
18 gency at Three Mile Island and to order a complete, effective
19 and well coordinated plan to evacuate at least a thirty mile
20 radius.

21 We are well aware that Met Ed's insurers become
22 financially responsible for people ordered to evacuate, but
23 not necessarily for those leaving voluntarily. We are abso-
24 lutely livid at the Governor's recommendations that permitted
25 middle class, suburban and mobile residents to move on their

1379 173

lrw10-8

1 own, leaving the poor, the urban, the immobile residents of
2 Middletown sitting on their doorsteps with a plume of radio-
3 active steam hovering above their town. Given this situation,
4 how could we trust these officials to alert our area to any
5 real danger?

6 Three, the most effective political statement we
7 could make was our own departure. We had a responsibility to
8 share our informed assessment of the danger with friends and
9 everyone else we could, and to coordinate an orderly exodus
10 from the danger zone without causing panic. We left the
11 Lehigh Valley on Sunday in an eight-car caravan. We were
12 clearly marked with "No Nukes" stickers and travelled with
13 headlights on as in a funeral procession. Although we
14 attempted to stop at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to
15 demonstrate our concerns, weather conditions, unfamiliarity
16 with the area and our physical and emotion exhaustion caused
17 us to go on.

18 As we write, we are more than 250 miles from Three
19 Mile Island. It is beginning to sound like the danger is at
20 least decreasing. We are somewhat relieved and hope that our
21 optimism is justified. However, we remain skeptical and
22 realize we shall never be the same.

23 Even once a cold shutdown is obtained, Central
24 Pennsylvania will have an unprecedented radioactive mess to
25 cope with. On our journey home, some of us want to go to

1 Washington to lobby Congress and the NRC. When we return to
2 the Lehigh Valley, we will begin work to insure that Three
3 Mile Island never goes back on line and that the company, not
4 the consumer, is held responsible for this accident. We will
5 continue our struggle for a nuclear-free Earth and welcome all
6 other anti-nuclear people to join us.

7 Little has happened since April 2 to change this
8 assessment. In fact, we have subsequently learned that at
9 least one study, the 1964-65 Working Papers for the Revision
10 of the Brookhaven Report of the Atomic Energy Commission, indi-
11 cated we were in greater health danger than we had thought.
12 The results of a worst case accident involving a small breach
13 of containment, if a city were involved, would be catastrophic
14 and there would be deaths out to 150 km. For this reason, I
15 find it incomprehensible that you are even considering ever
16 operating TMI 1 or 2 as nuclear facilities again.

17 We have worked very hard before and since March 28
18 to help people effectively express their concern about the
19 dangers of nuclear power. We will be grateful when commissions
20 and boards like this one come to eventually realize and/or
21 accept the truth that nuclear power is an unacceptable risk.

22 One example of our work is the ad -- a copy is
23 attached -- we ran in the local newspaper October 29. The ad
24 does not address specifically the Three Mile Island plant but
25 does represent the depth of opposition to nuclear power that

lrw10-10

1 has developed since March 28.

2 To help understand how much people geographically
3 closer to TMI have suffered from this accident, it is impor-
4 tant to also note the fears, anger, frustration and concerns
5 of people in areas further away.

6 How are you going to answer the young mother who is
7 unable to understand how utility managers can consider expos-
8 ing her children and other children to any extra levels of
9 radiation when she now knows that any level of ionizing radia-
10 tion exposure is harmful?

11 How can you answer the people who are fearful of the
12 proposed Krypton gas releases from Unit 2, let alone the
13 complications that would result if TMI 1 is also operating on
14 the island?

15 Why is Met Ed "responsible" for any activities on
16 Three Mile Island after the reckless manner in which they
17 risked thousands of lives and continue threatening those lives?
18 The profits and image first, people be damned attitude must be
19 replaced by a more sensitive, conscientious entity to deal
20 with this radioactive disaster.

21 Our lives have been disrupted and damaged. Many
22 have lost hope for the future and lost faith and trust in
23 people and institutions as a result of the accident. The
24 callous activity of Met Ed has not been followed by apologies
25 or statements of concern, but extensive and expensive efforts

1379 176

lrw10-11

1 to deny the hazards TMI has raised along with an effort to
2 sell us on lowered expectations in life - there are risks in
3 everything.

4 If you allow this attitude to continue by putting
5 Unit 1 back on line as a nuclear facility, you can expect at
6 least some expressions of extreme anger, possibly the health-
7 lest response, but you will also kill the spirit of many.
8 Hopelessness, cynicism, feelings of helplessness will be in-
9 creased. You have a responsibility to protect our health and
10 safety by not reopening TMI Unit 1 but you also have a re-
11 sponsibility to protect the spiritual and emotion wellbeing of
12 all people your actions will touch.

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

14 Susan Carty. Following Susan Carty will be Steven
15 Kraft. If Mr. Kraft will be ready to follow Miss Carty,
16 that would save some time.

17 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF SUSAN CARTY

18 MS. CARTY: I am Susan Carty from Easton, Pennsyl-
19 vania and I am a Met Ed customer. I was wondering where we
20 were --

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I doubt if you are being heard at
22 the rear of the room. We found, with this system, you have to
23 speak clearly into the microphone and rather close to it.

24 MS. CARTY: I was wondering where we were on your
25 list of priorities prior to the March 28 incident and where we

1rw10-12

1 are now on your list of priorities as far as the licensing
2 goes.

3 I don't feel that the plant should be licensed.
4 That's really all I have to say. I just feel there is no one
5 we can go to or talk to. I don't feel that anyone listens to
6 us.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

8 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF STEVEN KRAFT

9 MR. KRAFT: My name is Steve Kraft. I live outside
10 of Coopersburg, Pennsylvania near the Bucks County-Lehigh
11 County line. That's about 75 miles downwind from Three Mile
12 Island. I lived in Harrisburg for 16 months in 1977 and 1978.

13 I am here to say that Three Mile Island must never
14 be reopened as a nuclear generating facility. Ever. Met Ed
15 already inflicted enough terror on the people of Central
16 Pennsylvania and I can assure you it extended out at least as
17 far as my community. I submit that to reopen this facility
18 under any circumstances is simply not acceptable. To merely
19 reopen the plant without -- or perhaps I should say until
20 another accident would do just that, extend this trauma and
21 destroy the morale of the people in this area.

22 Much has been said of the financial consequences of
23 refusing to allow the utility to reopen Three Mile Island.
24 Even to the extent of possibly causing the bankruptcy of GPU.
25 If that is the case, I say so be it. If the investors, the

lrw10-13

1 individuals and the institutions which own General Public
2 Utilities lose their money, then that is the price they pay
3 for investing in this unsound and unsafe technology.

4 I can even see a positive benefit of bankruptcy of
5 GPU in that it would allow the communities affected to set up
6 their own truly public utility. I submit that it is the
7 responsibility of public officials -- I include you -- to
8 protect the interest of the public and not the interest of
9 risk capital.

10 Let's also look at the other side of the coin. If
11 Met Ed would be adversely affected by not being allowed to
12 open Three Mile Island, there are a number of individuals and
13 people in this area who will be adversely affected if the
14 facility is reopened.

15 Specifically, real estate values in this area will
16 be further depressed. Some people will feel compelled to
17 leave their jobs and leave the area. In general, I submit
18 that the entire economy of this region will be adversely
19 affected.

20 These are people's lives we are talking about. I
21 submit that these considerations are more weighty and more
22 worthy of consideration than the financial interests of the
23 utility and its investors. These are not my only reasons for
24 opposing the reopening of Three Mile Island but this is all I
25 have to say at this time. Thank you.

1379 179

lrw10-14

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, sir.

2 Mr. Tilson, who will be followed by Mary Sammelson,
3 who will then be followed by Scott Johnston.

4 LIMITED APPEARANCE OF EDWARD P. TILSON

5 MR. TILSON: My name is Edward P. Tilson. I am a
6 professional engineer. That might lead some people to feel
7 now they know which side I'm on. I think there is an innate
8 feeling in these hearings that a person is either pro or anti
9 and that you can tell a lot about them from their background.
10 Like I'm one of the bad guys because of the way I'm dressed.
11 If I had jeans and a sweater, I would be a good guy.

12 I'm doing this from notes rather than a prepared
13 statement because, unfortunately, my personal life has partic-
14 ular responsibilities right now. I am in the process of mov-
15 ing about 300 miles and I have been looking for a house, so I
16 came up here -- I'm doing this at my own expense, and have
17 come about an extra 200 miles.

18 I am a professional engineer. I work in the envir-
19 onmental field. I have a mixed feeling on this. On the one
20 hand, I am pro nuclear power. On the other hand, I am opposed
21 to the structure, the institutional structure, as it currently
22 exists. I will elaborate on both of these over the next few
23 minutes.

24 I think right now, not only the United States but
25 western civilization in general -- because Europe is very

1379 190

lrw10-15

1 involved in this, is involved in a crisis of economic sur-
2 vival. We are dependent on resources that are other than our
3 own, that are coming from the Middle East and from South
4 America, from areas of basically poor people who are gradually
5 starting to realize that they have these resources and they
6 can control them. Vietnam underscored this to a large extent.

7 What is particularly troublesome here is that the
8 United States has not adjusted to Vietnam and the lesson of
9 Vietnam that no longer can the resources that belong to other
10 people be usurped. You have to do the best with what you
11 have. The wars of resources are going very poorly for the
12 west.

13 In viewing the anti-nuclear power movement, I am
14 particularly perturbed because I see a lot of social energy
15 going into this, energy which I feel could be better applied
16 in a hundred different other ways. There are tens of thou-
17 sands, hundreds of thousands, millions of corporations of
18 people who are dying of real things, real problems that can
19 be alleviated, and yet many people are fixating on the
20 theoretical hypothetical possible one individual, ten
21 individuals.

22 If you ask the medical profession, the general feel-
23 ing is that most cancer comes from irritants of a chemical
24 nature and there is not a serious radiological potential. We
25 hear very much about the pack a day of cigarettes but not the

1379 181

lrwl0-16

1 half pack a day the average American gets from air pollution.
2 This causes, in the belief of many people, the major part of
3 the medical profession, many of the hundreds of thousands of
4 cases of cancer every year.

5 I can't be very well disposed towards the system
6 because I have been on blacklists. I was involved in the un-
7 covering of a chemical waste in the State of Wisconsin called
8 polychlorinatedbiphenols. I was put on the State of Wisconsin
9 blacklist. A high level official within the state legislature
10 for the State of Wisconsin, when this was finally thrashed
11 out and the people who were behind the cover-up were brought
12 to task, he said what should be done with these people? He is
13 now a majority leader in the Wisconsin State Assembly. I
14 said to him if anything were done to these people, if some
15 punishment, if action were taken against them, it would be
16 unfortunate because it would so show what they did was right.

17 Then I found that notwithstanding my magnanimous
18 attitude, that people struck against me and there was every
19 implication of a blacklist.

20 With respect to polychlorinated biphenols, and it
21 may seem I am digressing but I think people will see the
22 point very shortly, they are fat soluble. There is the impli-
23 cation of that and the high levels in women's milk that these
24 are implicated in breast cancer and possible cancer of the
25 colon in men, which are reaching epidemic proportions. The

lrw10-17

1 number of mastectomies and colostomies every year is growing.
2 The feeling is this is coming from electrical transformers.
3 It became very popular now that the problem has been identified.
4 Some of the people who gave no support to the identification
5 of this problem are now on it and are beating away at industry
6 at the use of these transformers and capacitors.

7 I believe, since it was in print and ink, it is now
8 in the newspapers, and, therefore, a lot of the responsibility
9 for this, the fact this material is showing up in snow melt,
10 lies with the journalist sector. In fact, the person who was
11 orchestrating the cover-up in Wisconsin was a journalist.

12 What I am saying is here we have a real problem, a
13 problem which has been identified, a problem which is not
14 theoretical, a problem of greater magnitude -- perhaps not
15 greater potential magnitude but nonetheless greater magnitude.
16 I would like to see a lot of the energy that goes into anti-
17 nuclear go into the chemical problems we do have.

18 Now the possibility of a long range problem from
19 radiological damage is a very severe one. It is a problem
20 that would be with you for a long time and for that reason it
21 can't be minimized. But there are considerable safeguards
22 against these circumstances. At Three Mile Island there was
23 not a disaster because the safety system did work in the
24 second plant. It was a backup safety system that worked when
25 the first system didn't, so there is considerable safeguard.

1379 183

L1710-18

1 Nonetheless, I don't think Three Mile Island 1
2 should go back on line until the problems already encountered
3 with Three Mile Island 2 are resolved and dealt with. But
4 once those problems are resolved and dealt with, to not open
5 it up against the possibility of some unknown future problems,
6 I do not agree with, and I think that this underscores again
7 a weakness of the anti-nuclear movement that it is very un-
8 specific. It preaches moratoriums which cost the U.S. a very
9 high industrial cost rather than identifying the very real
10 problems that are there, the disposal of wastes.

11 A professor, I think at the University of Arizona,
12 I'm not sure, has come up with a possible way of neutralizing
13 these wastes. Certainly, that should be explored. There is
14 the problem of siting, which has, to a large extent, already
15 been worked but maybe would be improved further. It may shock
16 people from this area to realize that Harrisburg, as far as
17 American cities go, is not a very large one and the plant was,
18 I think, about 15 miles south of the city. So siting is not
19 the worst case. But possibly there is room for improvement.

20 And then, of course, there are the backup system
21 possibilities of improvement in the backup systems. One thing
22 that particularly worries me is the coefficients of heat
23 generation were too low. These were in error. And every
24 indication points to a big cover-up on this because I believe
25 it was 70 or 80 designers of nuclear power plants used these

1379 184

lrw10-19

1 figures. There was never any questioning.

2 I have worked on research and very rarely is there
3 questioning. Everything is taken for granted. When you run
4 across something in error, it is extremely hard to find where
5 it originated because you find so much repetition of error.
6 You have to go back ten or twelve times that a thing has been
7 repeated that is in error because people have never, along the
8 way, questioned a basic assumption. Invariably, when you trace
9 it back to the original thing, you find it was taken out of
10 context. Generally, there was a qualifying statement.

11 This is something I would like to see -- I would
12 like to see these coefficients, find out where they originated.
13 Find out this whole process where the wrong coefficients were
14 used. Find out whose responsibility it was to see that these
15 coefficients were right. And they they use the wrong ones and
16 crucify these people.

17 I have been through this. When I found PCBs and
18 ended up on a blacklist, that interfered with my employment
19 for several years, there was no magnanimous showing to me. If
20 a person has their license and they are on the line, they are
21 responsible for what they put down. They put material and
22 below that sign their name PE and they have a legal responsi-
23 bility for this. I would like to see these people rooted out
24 because I don't think that as long as a guy is a nice guy but
25 he is incompetent it's okay. I think heads should roll because

1379 185

lrw10-20

1 we have very serious problems here.

2 Now with respect to the anti-nuclear movement, I have
3 often infiltrated meetings that inclined towards the third
4 international, towards Marxist Leninist, towards CP sources.
5 I say infiltrated because I am not of this political persuasion
6 but I feel I should be informed and I feel that, as a free
7 agent, I have worked as a free agent -- I haven't been employed
8 by the CIA, I haven't been employed by the FBI, and the word
9 at these meetings is there is a high priority on shutting down
10 nuclear power. Another priority is ending the draft, keeping
11 the draft ended. If there should be a draft again, tear the
12 campuses apart. These things take priority over other matters
13 like rights for gays and South Africa. These are the two
14 matters which right now have a very high priority.

15 What bothers me about the anti-nuclear movement is a
16 lot of times people don't question who is organizing there.
17 Where is the money coming from for this? Sometimes there are
18 volunteer groups, groups which are \$15,000 in arrears, but I
19 don't think this is always the case. I know various scientists
20 and nuclear engineers identified the -- I believe it was the
21 Stern Foundation, or the Stark Foundation -- I think it's
22 Stern -- who is behind us? Whose money is this? Is this
23 Arab money involved in this? Certainly OPEC gains from the
24 shutting down of nuclear power.

25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Tilson, how much longer do you

1379 186

lrw10-21

1 have in your statement?

2 MR. WILSON: I have about three or four minutes.

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I do believe you are digressing.

4 MR. WILSON: I'm coming much closer to the direct
5 point.

6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: And you have used -- no one has
7 been turned off yet in any appearance before this board.
8 Everyone has had all the time they needed. But I do want to
9 point out to you that you are digressing and you have used
10 more time and -- more than anyone else yet who has ever
11 appeared.

12 MR. WILSON: Okay, I'm coming even closer to the
13 points I'm going to come to but I'm trying to show I am
14 approaching this in a reasonably unobjective way -- objective
15 way.

16 I have everything to gain from the remained closing
17 of TMI 1. I have stock in Gulf General and Gulf Resources
18 and Chemical, which has non-union coal power plants in Western
19 Pennsylvania. My very close friend and next door neighbor has
20 stock in Niagra Mohawk, making money for this. I am running
21 counter to that economic interest. I am running counter to
22 that interest right now because I think nuclear power is
23 important.

24 I would like to show something which particularly
25 perturbs me about the institutional structure and the handling

1379 187

lrw10-22

1 of this matter, such that I think the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission and the people set up to oversee this are playing
3 into the hands of people who want to shut down nuclear power.
4 I sent a telegram at my own expense, that cost me \$7 or \$8, to
5 Howard -- Harold Denton during the time of the accident at
6 TMI 2. I brought out a major technical consideration. That
7 reactor was under pressure. The pressure was produced by
8 hydrogen gas. In a shell structure, when it is under internal
9 pressure, you have the development of tension and tension
10 creates hairline cracks in a reinforced concrete structure.
11 Therefore, you have the opening such that the hydrogen gas
12 could be getting into the reinforcing steel and producing
13 liquid hydrogen embrittlement in the steel.

END 10

1379 188

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Now this is something that should be looked into.

I was never consulted back on this, there was never anyone said, "Gee, thank you for raising that, we've looked into it, here is what we think."

So I think there has been a cover-up in this matter.

I also proposed the use of liquid nitrogen in problems of this sort to cool the reactor down, to increase the solubility of the gas in the circulating fluids and it would not produce a fire hazard. It's a relatively inert material. I heard nothing further on this, and this is why I challenged the institution handling of this problem.

And particularly because nuclear power is so very important.

And I'll tell you the ways in which it is important. Unemployment, a very hypothetical kind of thing for people who have jobs, but it is a real thing, 5 or 6 percent of the people are unemployed. Someone was here and he said his son was born prematurely.

At some point my girl friend was pregnant, and we don't always have the say in these things. When I couldn't find work, she terminated that. That was a real casualty of unemployment.

Many people commit suicide when there is unemployment, when they are unemployed. 10,000 people possibly a week commit suicide when they are unemployed. We'll say a

1 month, but it is a very high number. And this is why, for
2 instance, Russell Mills who appeared yesterday, if he is
3 unemployed, it doesn't seem to bother him as much as it
4 bothered a friend of mine, Mike Vasseri, who jumped off the
5 Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco.

6 Jane Deavin said that she was from the League
7 of Women Voters.

8 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. --

9 MR. TILSON: This will be my last point. I have
10 two more points to make.

11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: May I ask that -- don't make
12 statements, statements which tend to ridicule previous speakers.
13 That will not be productive at all.

14 MR. TILSON: Well, okay. I'm challenging a point.

15 [Applause.]

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Challenge them academically and
17 intellectually.

18 MR. TILSON: Okay. There was a speaker from the
19 League for Women Voters who said that she had support of
20 the State and National. I hope this isn't so, because I've
21 always respected the League for Women Voters. I know when I
22 ran for City Council once, I got a decent and fair hearing
23 from the League for Women Voters that I could not get in the
24 press. And the reason that I hope that this support doesn't
25 come is because of a discussion I had with my fiancee's

1 father. He was in the Luftwaffe in the last war, and he
2 said -- the family suffered very terribly. I don't think
3 they were Nazis, but they believed in the Fatherland, and
4 what happened was he lost his father on the Russian Front,
5 he lost his brother at Stalingrad, and he himself -- whatever
6 he did, I don't know, he was decorated and got the Iron Cross,
7 and I was very brashly teasing him and I said to him, I said,
8 "Well, if you repented for these bad things you did," and
9 he said this, "In the scheme of history, democracies are very
10 short-lived things. They have existed, they have existed
11 for maybe a hundred years or 200 years, but they depend on
12 nothing so much as the self-restraint of the people who make
13 up these democracies." And then in the absence of that self-
14 restraint, the totalitarian system is very strong.

15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Please conclude now.

16 MR. TILSON: Okay. The point I'm making in this
17 is that there is, I think, a call for self-restraint, for
18 people to realize that you can't have as a low-risk environment,
19 that there are industrial accidents, that people are injured,
20 that people are killed, that this is the price of a standard
21 of living, and that when resources decline, you have to
22 develop new technologies.

23 My understanding is 60 percent of all pregnancies
24 in Japan are terminated by abortion. This is the price they
25 have to pay because they are a resource-poor nation, and

1 they have their limits, but this is real casualties, and this
2 is the situation that the United States is increasingly going
3 to have to develop in the years to come.

4 They are going to have to develop a way that
5 they exploit and they use technology because certainly this
6 is the only reason Japan can have as many people as it does
7 have.

8 And what bothers me is that the feelings against
9 Three Mile Island 1 have an anti-technology character; that
10 if people want to say, "Don't reopen Three Mile Island 2,"
11 I've pointed out various problems with Three Mile Island 2
12 that maybe it shouldn't be reopened, but not to reopen Three
13 Mile Island 1 is to say that you are afraid of what might be
14 there, rather than what you know to be there.

15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, now, that's a good concluding
16 point, I believe, Mr. Tilson.

17 [Applause.]

18 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF MARY SAMUELSON.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: My name is Mary Samuelson. I am
20 here officially representing the Peach Bottom Alliance of
21 Harvard County, Maryland. I am a resident of Aberdeen, Maryland.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think you're going to have
23 difficulty being heard. Just move the microphone right up
24 next to you.

25 MS. SAMUELSON: Is this better?

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, it is.

2 MS. SAMUELSON: Okay.

3 We are a grass roots group of diverse individuals
4 who share an urgent concern for the dangers of nuclear power.

5 Personally speaking, I am a wife and a mother
6 who approaches the issue of nuclear safety from that viewpoint.
7 As a mother, I am not willing to risk any level of damage to
8 the environment or to my children.

9 However, today, I'd like to just speak unofficially
10 on behalf of Harvard County and the citizens of the state of
11 Maryland.

12 We in the state of Maryland are very concerned about
13 the safety of our Chesapeake Bay. The connection between
14 the bay and TMI is the Susquehanna River which, as has been
15 previously stated, supplies 60 percent of the fresh water to
16 the bay, and this directly affects our economy, our livelihoods,
17 our environment, and our safety.

18 The health of the bay is of the utmost importance
19 to every single citizen in the state. I think I can pretty
20 safely make that statement.

21 Before you reopen TMI-1, we strongly feel that
22 the clean-up process at TMI-2 should be concluded, we do not
23 want one single drop of waste water, treated or untreated, to
24 enter the Susquehanna River, including the routine operating
25 releases from a reopened TMI-1, before a complete and long-range

1 environmental assessment encompassing the Chesapeake Bay has
2 been made and publicly accepted by the people of the state of
3 Maryland.

4 We want the possible contamination of our bay to
5 be considered along with the safety of the many communities
6 which use the Susquehanna River for drinking water, recreation
7 and commercial fishing.

8 We feel that too much radioactivity has already
9 been released into the river, and we strongly object to anything
10 which might add to this.

11 Oysters in the bay have already shown evidence of
12 radioactive silver nitrate in independent testing done by
13 the Chesapeake Energy Alliance.

14 TMI-1 and TMI-2 cannot be separated due to their
15 physical proximity, and we feel that TMI-1 might be needed
16 in the process of the water clean-up to store the waste water
17 which we do not want dumped into the river.

18 If this is costly in terms of dollars for Met Ed,
19 we feel that this is the risk which they undertook when they
20 built the plant on such a major waterway, and that the cost
21 in terms of livelihood, health and safety to the population
22 down river and in a state which is so dependent on its
23 fishing and seafood industry are far more important.

24 We would just like to have some assurance from
25 you that our interests will be considered. We want proof

1 beyond a shadow of a doubt that Met Ed is capable of cleaning
2 up TMI-2 without endangering our bay before the reopening of
3 TMI-1 is even considered.

4 Thank you very much.

5 [Applause.]

6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Just a moment, please.

7 DR. LITTLE: Do you know that Chesapeake Energy
8 Alliance is involved in the case in the proceedings?

9 MS. SAMUELSON: They are trying to act through the
10 office of Steven Sachs, the Attorney General of the State of
11 Maryland, to file an injunction requiring an environmental
12 impact statement on the bay itself. Now they have a
13 biologist -- I can't supply his name or his credentials --
14 who did the testing in the bay on the oysters and found the
15 radiocativity.

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The Chesapeake Energy Alliance,
17 Inc. is a party to this very proceeding in which we are
18 presiding. They just happen not to be here today, but they
19 are a party, and I might say in response to your urging that
20 we pay close attention to this problem, I am very interested
21 in it. My family and I spend much time on the bay. I have a
22 sailboat there. We eat the very oysters to which you refer,
23 and at the very least it is a very interesting subject matter
24 to me.

25 MS. SAMUELSON: Okay. Thank you.

1 DR. JORDAN: I had a question also on that matter.
2
3 You mentioned that the oysters in the bay, I believe, are
4 contaminated with silver nitrate, and I wondered if you had a
5 feeling there is a connection between that and the TMI?

6 MS. SAMUELSON: I would just like to know if there
7 is. Personally I have no idea. I would like to hear from
8 somebody what the connection would be.

9 DR. JORDAN: Thank you.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: Thank you.

11 [Applause.]

12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Scott Johnston.

13 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF SCOTT JOHNSTON.

14 MR. JOHNSTON: I am Scott Johnston. I live in
15 Hershey, and I didn't come prepared to speak today, but
16 there was some concern about the metallic taste earlier in
17 the hearing, and I had tasted the metallic taste with two
18 other people on Sunday after the accident, on Route 285,
19 just before Middletown. We just kind of drove right
20 through it. It was like it was a plume coming out through, and
21 after we started to taste it, you could taste it on your
22 tongue first, and then it kind of set up an electrical current
23 in my fillings and through my teeth.

24 And I went back after that a couple of times
25 because I thought maybe there were high tension wires over-
head which may have caused that, but there wasn't anything

1 Like that there, and I just thought you may --

2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is this the electrolytic taste?

3 MR. JOHNSTON: I don't know. I can't explain it.

4 Although, you know, what -- and there are two other people
5 that also could be a witness to that. But the current
6 setting up in the fillings was -- I'm not sure what it was.
7 I spoke to some other people who work for the Environmental
8 Protection Agency, and they thought that it may have been
9 iodine which was an ion that was attacking the calcium and the
10 silver in the fillings.

11 I have one other question. I think this is a good
12 idea to have a hearing and have everybody make their comments,
13 but why don't we have a referendum vote in the spring with
14 the primaries and just have a yes-no vote, and have everyone
15 in the area vote yes or no for nuclear power.

16 [Applause.]

17 And then have you use that also as your basis for
18 making a decision.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think probably the shortest
20 answer to that is that certainly you realize that this Board
21 has no authority to require such a hearing.

22 MR. JOHNSTON: How could we go about doing that?

23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't know.

24 MR. JOHNSTON: I think it's a good idea.

25 DR. JORDAN: Many states have had referendum votes,

1 and so you can see how they have done it, and be guided
2 thereby.

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: It is a state matter.

4 MR. JOHNSTON: It is a state matter?

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, sir. It would not be a
6 federal election at all.

7 MR. JOHNSTON: Wouldn't you -- I'm sure you're
8 concerned about making this decision. Wouldn't you be for a
9 referendum vote?

10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: It is totally irrelevant how we
11 feel about that.

12 MR. JOHNSTON: I see. So it would be us as the
13 public to try to get that started?

14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We have an assignment from the
15 Nuclear Regulatory Commission to preside over an evidentiary
16 hearing, and that is the reach of our jurisdiction. Our
17 personal attitudes are beyond the scope of this consideration.

18 MR. JOHNSTON: Would you be in favor of it?

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: As I say, even if I had a
20 personal attitude on it, I could not express it.

21 MR. JOHNSTON: I see. Okay. Thank you.

22 [Applause.]

23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Donna Christianson.

24 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF DONNA CHRISTIANSON.

25 MS. CHRISTIANSON: I don't know, you tell me, am I

1 close enough?

2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: No.

3 DR. JORDAN: You're not speaking loudly enough.

4 MS. CHRISTIANSON: My name is Donna Christianson.

5 I am from Beavertown, 40 miles northwest of TMI. I'm not
6 too good with notes and stuff, but I just came out of a gut
7 reaction feeling that's been within me since the accident,
8 and well -- psychologically speaking, that's really hard to
9 say.

10 Many, many people up our way, the worst of it
11 got to the death point. We kind of agreed one Sunday, some
12 of us got together and just -- when the big bubble was, you
13 know, friends, older people and younger people, you know,
14 were at our house, and we just were like saying goodbye, you
15 know.

16 But physically -- that was maybe mental -- but
17 physically I had an experience -- I was not confirmed pregnant,
18 but in February, you know, I was sure I was, and when we got
19 the northwest winds April 1st, I woke and I was bleeding heavy,
20 you know, heavier than a normal period.

21 I have a young baby, he was throwingup long
22 strings of mucousy stuff. We had headaches and I had a bit of
23 a nosebleed.

24 Since then, April 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, I
25 bled heavy and on and off after that. I continued to just

1 spot, not enough to go to the doctor, and I'm that oriented,
2 anyhow, but I had a dead fetus come out of me here -- what
3 date -- I had some hemorrhaging September 3rd and 29th, and
4 then October 17th a fetus was expelled from me.

5 I am not the only one, though. For me, I've
6 known about nuclear power and I'm trying to learn about it,
7 but many other women at Lewisburg Hospital there, about 50
8 miles from here in the hospital, one of my friends that I
9 worked with, she was due here in November. Her baby is three
10 weeks old. One of the nurses told her mother, she said, "I
11 don't know why, but we've been having an awful lot of this of
12 late," and that's not the only report from within, that they've
13 been having a lot of miscarriages, hemorrhaging.

14 I have friends of my sister, other women, at
15 least a dozen people that I know of that have been, uterinewise,
16 bleeding, and having troubles that way. They are having
17 misses -- miscarriages or just bleeding.

18 That baby that was born three weeks ago, they did
19 spinal tests on it, it was in convulsions, and now they're
20 doing mental tests on it; born small.

21 So it would have been conceived around that time.

22 I know of another one that was born dead, you know,
23 it would have been conceived around that time, and it was
24 about four or five months gestation, you know, stillborn.

25 Also in around there when my baby was throwing
up, the people we get milk off of, I went there and they were

1 consoling me, saying that's all my nerves, you know. And
2 they had calves throwing up. They never ever had calves
3 throw up in their 20-some years of farming.

4 These are maybe just mental things, but the calves
5 didn't know what was going on, you know.

6 There is no studies being done at all, from different
7 answers of people I have been trying to contact. They say it
8 is too expensive.

9 I have a little boy. I wonder how, you know, the
10 way it's going, you know, where the money is being put, to
11 boil water. It's scary.

12 [Applause.]

13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.

14 Dianne Stazewski, please.

15 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF DIANNE STAZEWSKI.

16 MS. STAZEWSKI: Just a short statement, please.

17 I live about five or six miles from TMI, and I do
18 not want it reopened. The people of this area have suffered
19 enough for one lifetime, in land losses, mental illness, and
20 only time will tell how much the radiation has affected us.

21 We are guinea pigs, and I don't like it.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Stazewski, I'm sure that no one
23 in the rear of the room can hear you. I doubt if they can hear
24 you back there.

25 MS. STAZEWSKI: Shall I start over?

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Just stand by the mike.

2 DR. JORDAN: Yes, just go ahead and start over. I
3 think they didn't hear you.

4 MS. STAZEWSKI: I live about five or six miles
5 from TMI, and I do not want it reopened. The people of this
6 area have suffered enough for one lifetime in land losses,
7 mental illness, and only time will tell how much the radiation
8 has affected us.

9 We are guinea pigs, and I don't like it. Until
10 the waste problem is solved, we don't have any business making
11 more waste. No new plants should be built. We have over-
12 whelming problems with the old.

13 As to this area, the plant is located too close
14 to populated areas, too close to an airport with huge
15 airplanes flying in and out and around the plant, not even
16 to mention the cost of the supposedly cheap nuclear power.

17 We are sitting with a time bomb in our back yards.
18 What has to happen to make these big shots with the money
19 listen to the people?

20 It's a shame in this country, where you are
21 supposed to have a government, supposed to be by the people
22 and for the people, and sometimes you wonder. People try to
23 work for change through the system, but most times it takes
24 violence in the streets before anybody will sit up and take
25 notice.

That's all.

[Applause.]

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

That completes our list of persons who have requested an opportunity to speak. We're going to take an intermission and return to see if anybody has arrived later who wishes to make a statement. So we'll take a 10-minute intermission and see what the situation is then.

[Recess.]

end 11

1379 203

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We have had one additional
2 request during the intermission from Dennis McHugh to make
3 a statement.

4 Mr. McHugh?

5 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF DENNIS MC HUGH

6 MR. MC HUGH: Hello.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We have had alternately a short
8 and tall speaker. It never seems to --

9 MR. MC HUGH: Sorry about that.

0 CHAIRMAN SMITH: -- two in a row that fit the
1 microphone.

2 MR. MC HUGH: I think this should do.

3 A little bit earlier. Mr. Smith, you addressed
4 one of the people who were up here speaking, and you said
5 that you wished he or she, I kind of forget, would be a
6 little bit more precise as to who "you" is when --

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, when a question is asked
8 or a reference is made to one of our actions --

9 MR. MC HUGH: Uh-huh.

20 CHAIRMAN SMITH: -- because we have already made
21 quite a few rulings in this case, and they're issues
22 pertaining to us, and we don't want confusion.

23 MR. MC HUGH: Sure.

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We want the public to under-
25 stand what has happened so far, and what we have done, and

1 what we are allowed to do.

2 MR. MC HUGH: Sure. I don't think I'm very
3 confused as to the differences between your powers and,
4 you know, the powers of the Commission, and the industry,
5 and things like that, but I guess I got a little bit bothered
6 by what was an attempt, and a righteous one and a correct
7 one, to separate the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board and
8 the Commission and the industry, and, and, and.

9 And for that, you need to be commended. However,
10 I at the same time want to get back to that and say that,
11 well, as separable as you might think yourselves to be, you
12 are very, very much inseparable. Not only from the NRC,
13 the Commissioners themselves, the industry, but also
14 from these people here. Those for and those against the
15 reopening, and those who have no opinion as far as the
16 reopening of Unit 1 or Unit 2 or any other reactor in this
17 country.

18 I can say that for a lot of reasons, if only for
19 the reason that the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board allowed
20 the opening of Unit 2 the first time, despite the fact that
21 the radon 222 question was not completely finished with.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The thing that I was trying to
23 stress with the speaker that I corrected, and I am trying
24 to stress, that she had stated, made statements which
25 suggested that this Board had made four or five rulings in

1 this case which in fact we had not made.

2 MR. MC HUGH: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: And I thought that that should
4 be known.

5 MR. MC HUGH: Okay.

6 DR. JORDAN: On the other hand, there was
7 another Atomic Safety and Licensing Board --

8 MR. MC HUGH: Yes.

9 DR. JORDAN: And they did, and you're perfectly
0 welcome to address that.

1 MR. MC HUGH: Okay.

2 DR. JORDAN: Fine.

3 MR. MC HUGH: And that they did allow that Unit 2
4 open at that time --

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes.

6 ~~MR. MC HUGH:~~ More or less ignoring, perhaps,
7 perhaps not, the radon 222 question; more or less ignoring --
8 perhaps, perhaps not -- the airport question. We're getting
9 a second chance, praise the Lord.

20 The second thing I'd like to talk about is,
21 we've heard it once before, we've heard it more than once,
22 all of us in this room have probably heard it more than
23 once, but in quotation marks, "an area the size of
24 Pennsylvania."

25 This didn't come from the ratings by antinuclear

1 activists. This didn't come from some radical group
2 somewhere in the United States or outside the United
3 States who was interested in the downfall of the atomic
4 energy industry. This came from more or less within the
5 industry itself, Brookhaven, perhaps. It took me about
6 two hours to get here, and in those two hours I got to see
7 a part of the state which I've seen many times, but maybe
8 you see it again one other time and you say to yourself:
9 Well, I've lived here all my life. I've been lots of other
0 places, but this is my home, and probably will continue to
1 be my home until my life terminates.

2 I find it extremely hard to believe -- so hard
3 to believe that I can't imagine it -- not being able to
4 come back to this beautiful state for a long period of time.

5 The other thing I'd like to bring up is that --
6 and the last -- and I am being imprecise for specific
7 reasons. We seem to act sometimes as if we're not going
8 to be here in 10 years, here, Pennsylvania, or even on this
9 planet, 20 years, 30 years, 50, 100, a couple thousand.

10 I'd like to run against that, run counter to
11 that feeling and say that we are going to be here. We're
12 going to be here for a long, long time, all of us in this
13 room, both pro and anti this issue, and we're going to have
14 to learn to live together on this planet for a long, long
15 time.

1 Thanks.

2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, sir.

3 DR. JORDAN: I guess, since the day is getting
4 long or near the end, I think business is about done, I
5 will just say one thing.

6 You might be surprised to learn about the radon
7 222 issue, that, could you guess who it was that pointed
8 out to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that they had made
9 a serious error by a factor of a million in the amount of
0 radon?

1 MR. MC HUGH: It was either you or Dr. Kepford
2 or a combination of the two. And thank you, very much.

3 DR. JORDAN: You do know. Good for you.

4 (Applause.)

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess we have exhausted for
6 this afternoon the persons who wish to make limited appearance
7 statements.

8 Yes, ma'am?

9 MS. DUIGNAN: May I ask a question?

10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, ma'am.

11 MS. DUIGNAN: I would like to know if had any
12 impression regarding the people who came here to make
13 statements. I think it took a lot of courage for a lot
14 of these people to come here and make these statements, and
15 I would like for your individual impressions about the

1 appearances made here today.

2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: In the first place, we cannot
3 comment upon the issues that they raised.

4 MS. DUIGNAN: I know that.

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: But my impression, which I had
6 mentioned earlier, was that not once since we've been up
7 here in this entire proceeding, and there have been many,
8 many people who are very emotional about this for reasons
9 which are quite obvious, not once have we been insulted,
10 have we been treated poorly -- I've passed them in the
11 hallway; everyone has always been courteous.

12 I have been in proceedings where I've been chased
13 out of the building, in rather minor proceedings.
14 Mr. Trowbridge I think observed me being chased out of a
15 building one time.

16 The group of people here have been in my view
17 extremely responsible people, and knowledgeable.

18 DR. JORDAN: And we have been interested very
19 much in the experience of the people in this area, and we
20 are delighted to have heard from so many.

21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: And helpful, too. Let's don't
22 forget that. We have had several suggestions which will
23 direct us into inquiries as the hearings come up.

24 DR. LITTLE: I'll just repeat, we have all been
25 very surprised at the -- I hate to use the word "sophistication."

1 But just the general knowledge of the people in the area
2 about not only nuclear power, but about environmental matters
3 as well.

4 I think all of the training sessions or whatever
5 that have been going on here since March have really paid
6 off.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, sir.

8 I heard the remark that "perhaps you've been too
9 nice." Perhaps that requires a reminder, again. Don't
10 make any assumptions about prejudgment by this Board in
11 this case.

12 We have heard not one word of evidence yet.
13 You don't know us, and you don't know what our decision is
14 going to be.

15 Yes, sir.

16 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF FRANCES ROTUNDA

17 MR. ROTUNDA: Mr. Smith, my name is Rotunda,
18 Frances Rotunda. I came unprepared to say anything, because
19 I actually had a feeling there wasn't anything for me to say,
20 but after hearing the comments this afternoon and seeing this
21 hearing proceed as it did, it sort of gives me a feeling of
22 frustration again that I wonder whether your group, since
23 you aren't able to really comment -- and I can understand
24 why you cannot enter into let's say an adversary stand, or
25 even comment in any way, shape, or form as to how you feel

1 about what is being said out here.

2 I just wonder whether, after all of this is done,
3 whether somehow the people of this community and any other
4 community in the country is going to find some assurance.
5 You know, we can get into emotionalism, and normally
6 whenever things like this happen, we're going to have a show
7 of emotions. Right now as we talk about our problem with
8 nuclear energy, there are people in this country that are
9 so very disturbed about only 60 people -- 60 Americans --
0 that are in an Embassy somewhere, and they're very indignant.

1 Now there are only 60 lives at stake there. There
2 may be no lives at stake. They may come out of that with
3 no problem at all. But during this period of time, there
4 is a sense of indignation in the country.

5 How do we get into this thing? And how do we
6 get out of this thing? I think that's what I'm seeing
7 here today. I'm seeing a group of people that are saying
8 the same thing:

9 How did we get into this thing? And how are we
10 going to get out of it?

11 Essentially, I don't think we should take sides
12 on it, until we know what it's all about. I have applauded
13 persons here this afternoon that have been pleading for help
14 that were standing here trying to tell you about the moral
15 side of it, the ethical side of it, the economical side of it,

1 or any other side of it. And you can slice that any number
2 of ways and come up with any kind of an answer you want.
3 Because I've seen it happen. Because I spent a good many
4 of my years with the bureaucracy, and I know that we could
5 present charts that could depict anything any way we
6 wanted to show it. That's a very simple thing to do.

7 So I don't think we can resolve it from that
8 point of view as to what is good and what is bad, or what
9 is evil or what is moral, or what is whatever.

0 I can probably come up with many reasons why
1 prostitution should be legalized, many reasons why. By the
2 same token, I can get many people to say that's immoral.
3 And on that ground alone, they're not going to legalize
4 prostitution.

5 So what I'm really trying to say is, my point
6 really is this: I hope that someone or some group of
7 people can follow the advice of a person on the Nuclear
8 Regulatory Commission who I think had an item in Fortune
9 Magazine not too long ago, where he's proposing his point of
10 view, as a personal point of view, not as the Nuclear
11 Regulatory Commission's point of view, but his own point of
12 view, that nuclear power can be safe if trusted to the best
13 brains that we can produce in this country to run it.

14 Now may be people can accept this, I don't know.
15 But I can see where they can be very skeptical about it

12-10 JTB

1 in spite of what may have been said here today. They can
2 be skeptical because their trust has been violated
3 somewhere along the way. I think we can agree that their
4 trust has been violated. And they're probably saying,
5 "When you can take an eraser off a pencil, then we're going
6 to breathe easier."

7 And that is in essence what I think it's all
8 about. So I hope that there can be an answer found, and
9 I hope that we don't have to hear the same story over and
0 over again a million times as to how people suffered through
1 this thing, and why they're frightened.

2 Now like I said before, I came here prepared to
3 say nothing. But I was stimulated by what I saw and heard
4 here today, and I couldn't resist coming up here and saying
5 a few words.

6 Thank you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, you're very welcome. We
8 appreciate your sentiments, too.

9 Anything else before we adjourn?

10 Yes, sir.

11 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF RON BORRUSO

12 MR. BORRUSO: My name is Ron Borruso. I really
13 didn't come prepared to say anything. I thought the place
14 would be pretty well packed, and I didn't have the time to
15 get off earlier, but I did get off earlier than I expected

to, to hear what was going to be said.

VOICE: Could you speak into the mike, please?
It's hard to hear you.

MR. DORRISO: Anyway, I just wanted to let you know what I went through, and hope I never have to go through it again with my family, and what I think I'm going to have to live with for the rest of my life.

On that Wednesday of the accident when I got home, my wife wanted to leave. I told her, "No, we weren't going to leave." I said, "Our government of course knows what's going on at that plant, and if there was any danger they would have told us to leave."

She wanted to get the kids and go. I have a son that at the time was only a year-and-a-half old, and my daughter was four years old. So we stayed.

On Thursday, we went through the same thing again. Me arguing with my wife telling her that we weren't going to leave, that the people over there knew what they were doing, that we could rely on them, it was our government and they would take care of us.

Believe me, up to this time I firmly believed that myself. Friday I listened to the early-morning news on TV. They told us that everything was okay. I had a meeting to attend to in Baltimore. I got down to the Maryland line and heard of this "uncontrolled 1200 millirem

1 release.' I still don't know what the hell that is.

2 I immediately turned around. I called my wife,
3 I told her: I think you're right. Pack your bags, I'll be
4 home in about 15 minutes and we're getting out of there.

5 I packed up my kids, I packed up my wife, my dog,
6 and we left the area and we went to New York. Now that's
7 something I'm going to have to live with, that I didn't take
8 the advice of my wife and get out. Because maybe a couple
9 of years from now, one of my children or both of my children
10 or my wife is going to come down with leukemia. Maybe 20
11 years from now I may have to live through it again if I have
12 to live through the leukemia, that maybe one of my
13 grandchildren is going to have birth defects, be deformed in
14 some way, I don't know. But that's something that I've got
15 to live with in my own heart and put up with for the rest
16 of my life, that maybe that decision to depend on my
17 government to tell me what to do was wrong.

18 I've lost a lot of confidence in that, and that's
19 the only reason I'm here today. That's the only reason I'm
20 now pursuing trying to keep that plant closed, because it
21 was the government -- our own government -- that we have
22 elected, and supposedly it's a democratic place, that we
23 can depend on and tell us that that place was safe, when
24 indeed they had no idea whether it was safe.

25 I didn't find out until probably two months after

1 the accident that the indicators or the monitors at that
2 plant went off the scale at 1000 rams -- and I don't know
3 if it was in the stacks, or where the heck it was -- but
4 they went off the scale and stayed off the scale for four
5 days.

6 Now how could anybody here in this room, or you
7 people up there, tell us that we only got 20 millirems, or
8 80 millirems, or whatever it was -- because I've heard all
9 kinds of different figures -- how can you tell us that we've
10 received any of that?

11 How do you know it didn't go up to 50,000 milli-
12 rems, or whatever? Now that's something that we've got to
13 live with in this area.

14 Now they're going through the cleanup. They're
15 probably going to take the cheapest way out. I heard the
16 other day that they're going to start with the krypton.
17 They want to let the krypton gas go.

18 The easiest way, they say, or the best way, is
19 to take it and just vent it into the air. Nobody cares
20 about -- I live 2-1/2 miles away from there. My kids
21 have already been subjected to it. My wife has been subjected
22 to it. I can't afford to leave this area for a month and
23 a half or three months while they vent that gas.

24 So we're going to have to live through it again.
25 I don't -- I really don't know what to do. So we're going

1 to have to stay here; we're going to have to live with it; and
2 we're going to have to depend on the facts that were given
3 that say we only had 20 milligrams, when God knows really
4 how much we've ever had, or how much we're going to be
5 subjected to in the future.

6 Why don't they take that gas and put it in
7 bottles, and ship it out in the ocean, and let it go out
8 there? If it's got to be vented into the air, ship it
9 out to the ocean and let it go out there. I'd rather it
10 killed a few fish, instead of me and my family.

11 That's all I have to say.

12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, sir.

13 Anything further?

14 LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT OF RITA SNYDER

15 MS. SNYDER: My name is Rita Snyder, and I
16 just want to address the three of you personally, since
17 you're going to be the ones making some -- advising the
18 NRC.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Would you get closer to the
20 microphone, please.

21 MS. SNYDER: And I just want to talk about
22 common sense. You know, when you have to go to the bathroom,
23 you go to the bathroom. When you're hungry, you eat. And
24 when your life is endangered, you know, by something, you
25 kind of want to stay away from that. 1379 217

1 And I don't think any of you can really say that
2 nuclear power doesn't pose some threat to your life. And
3 I know that you're probably under a lot of pressure from
4 the nuclear industry officials in the NRC --

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: You are entirely wrong about
6 that. We are under no pressure from the nuclear industry,
7 no pressure from anyone in the NRC.

8 MS. SNYDER: Well, I --

9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: None whatever.

10 MS. SNYDER: Maybe not directly. You know, I
11 don't know that. But I know, just from being a person on
12 this planet and in this country and being bombarded by
13 television and newspapers, et cetera, et cetera, which some-
14 times subversively, sometimes outwardly, push for things
15 like nuclear power, and MacDonal'd's hamburgers, that we
16 are all under pressure.

17 And I would just ask that you really look to
18 yourselves, and look to what you feel is really right.

19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

20 MS. SNYDER: And just know that your decision is
21 right with you, and that you can live with what you decide.

22 Thanks.

23 end JWB
24 12
25

1379 218

lrw-13-1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

Anybody else?

MS. HARLAN: I would appreciate the opportunity to apologize to the members of the panel for any offense I caused by my inadvertent and obvious misuse of the word "you." I used it in the sense of referring to the NRC in general and those officials, whoever they may be, that were in charge of all the activities that have evolved either before or after this Three Mile Island Unit 2 accident.

I did not mean to imply that you personally were responsible for it in any way or in any way involved in the cleanup operations, and I apologize for possibly giving a wrong inference.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: That was Marion Harlan speaking, Mr. Reporter, and your statement is very much appreciated. We didn't take it personally. The only reason I made the remarks is I did not want the record to be confused and have people think we had made rulings which, in fact, we had not made. We had not even come to yet.

DR. JORDAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: That will conclude this afternoon's session.

(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 4:00 P.M.)

END13

1379 219