

April 15, 1980

Director
Three Mile Island Support
NRR
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

I am hoping that this letter gets to your office in time. When I first read the small article in the local newspaper about your addendum to vent in five days instead of sixty days, I did nothing because the mechanics of it all just didn't become clear to me. However, my husband and I were discussing it and have come to a layman's conclusion that Krypton gas vented over five days will not disperse as easily as gas vented over a sixty day period. It seems it would be concentrated and thus more detrimental to the public than if vented over a longer time.

I might make it clear now that both my husband and I oppose venting of any Krypton gas. Apparently Met-Ed has indicated that other methods would be less safe. However, their explanation is so vague it lacks credibility. As to why cryogenics can't be used, they explain that it is a fairly new un-tried method and has only a 75% to 99% chance of success. I assume that percentage refers to the Krypton gas released. It would seem obvious, therefore, that if that occurred, only 25% to 1% of the Krypton gas would have to be released as opposed to 100%. Maybe I misunderstood the gentleman. As to being un-tried, your average nuclear plant doesn't lose coolant water every day, thereby damaging the core and causing radioactive gases to be released. It was a new, un-tried accident. Met-Ed didn't even mention entombment which is the cheapest method of all. However, though some people claim it is the safest, I have my doubts. The point I am trying to make is that Met-Ed has told the public that venting is the only way and I don't believe them. Had they researched all methods and presented an intelligent explanation for each and every method and then opted for the venting, I might feel differently. Their vague reasons for using the venting and not other methods were only presented after public prodding. Met-Ed's public briefings were held to tell the public that they were going to vent. Now they will not hold public briefings on venting because they think erroneously that we the public are hysterical. Maybe you feel the same way.

In conclusion, I might say that when the esteemed gentlemen in public office decided back in the 1940's and 50's that nuclear power would be our modern-day panacea, they neglected to project far enough into the future. They assumed the highly radioactive wastes would take care of itself. They assumed accidents just wouldn't happen. They failed to realize that nuclear power isn't something that you wean from government into private industry's hands making it subject to profit and production. Worst of all, they didn't

8004220418

DOE 3/10

Page 2

and still don't realize that low-level radiation can slowly affect future generations of mankind. Why compound the background radiation we all ready receive with "minor" releases from nuclear power plants? I propose that until the great minds of the world research safer ways of operating nuclear power plants and ways of dealing with radioactive wastes, we have no business operating them and using ours and future generations as unwitting guinea pigs.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Kathleen A. Bevel

Mrs. Kathleen A. Bevel

1155 Turnpike Rd.

Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022

(within the 5-mile radius)