

ORIGINAL

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

1  
 NRC  
 Middletown 2  
 2-12-80 3  
 I tchett/4  
 Burrell  
 5  
 Tape 1  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

SCOPING MEETING ON PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
 FOR DECONTAMINATION OF THREE MILE ISLAND, UNIT II

Liberty Fire Hall (second floor)  
 Adelle and Emaus Streets  
 Middletown, Pennsylvania

Tuesday, February 12, 1980  
 7:30 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.

8002280 665 T

I N D E X1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25STATEMENT OF:PAGE

Joan Ghiselin

17

Michael Benko

20

Al Manik

31

Mary Osborn

33

Jane Kohr

38

Jane Lee

41

Susan Barley

54

James Morgan

60

Timothy Murphy

72

Irene Snyder

86

Ed Charles

92

Barbara Heivly

96

James Hurst

101

Carrie Light

107

Mickey Minnich

111

P A R T I C I P A N T S

1  
2  
3 DONALD SELLS, Acting Chief, Environmental Project Branch

4 RICHARD VOLLMER, Director, Three Mile Island Support

5 JOHN COLLINS, Deputy Director, Three Mile Island Support

6 DANIEL MULLER, Deputy Director, Division of Site Safety and  
7 Environmental Analyses

8 AUDIENCE SPEAKERS:

9 Joan Ghiselin

Mickey Minnich

10 Michael Benko

11 Al Manik

12 Mary Osborn

13 Jane Kohr

14 Jane Lee

15 John Garver

16 Susan Borley

17 James Morjan

18 Anne Sessa

19 Timothy Murphy

20 Donald Hossoer

21 Irene Snyder

22 Edward Charles

23 Barbara Heivly

24 James Hurst

25 Carrie Light

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:30 p.m.)

1  
2  
3 MR. VOLLMER: Good evening. We welcome you to the  
4 second scoping meeting for the environment impact statement that  
5 is being prepared for the evaluation of the environmental  
6 impacts of the decontamination and cleanup process of Three  
7 Mile Island, Unit Two.

8 The first such meeting was held on January 29th in  
9 Harrisburg at the Forum, and the very last meetings that are  
10 currently planned will be held in Baltimore this coming Friday  
11 at the Maryland University campus at 7:30.

12 The purpose of this meeting is to solicit the comments  
13 from state and local officials and members of the public con-  
14 cerning the scope which the environmental impact statement should  
15 cover, and in particular, the emphasis or the topics that are  
16 most important for the people affected.

17 The scoping meeting is required by new regulations of  
18 the Council of Environmental Quality, which is the agency  
19 reporting to the President, which is responsible to see that all  
20 other federal agencies meet their responsibilities under the  
21 National Environmental Policy Act.

22 So the meeting again tonight is really to get your  
23 input into the process, to find out some of the things that we  
24 may or may not already know that are of most concern to you.  
25 These will be then factored in to whatever extent that we can

1 into the prepared documents that will eventually come out in  
2 draft form, hopefully in June of this year, at which time they  
3 will be circulated and you will be given an opportunity, the  
4 public and agencies, state and local agencies, the federal  
5 agencies, will be given an opportunity to comment on the document  
6 and following this will be the preparation of a final statement  
7 again hopefully by the end of the year.

8 In a few minutes I am going to turn the microphone  
9 over to Mr. Sells at the end of the table, who will discuss what  
10 we currently envision as the table of contents of this statement,  
11 but first I would like to spend a couple of minutes giving you  
12 background that led up to it.

13 As you are all very well aware, the contamination caused  
14 by the accident has precipitated a great deal of concern, a  
15 number of problems, and a lot of activities on the site.

16 The first of the cleanup activities that was  
17 instituted was the construction of a system called EPICOR that  
18 was initially put in to clean up the water, contaminated water  
19 that existed in the auxiliary building.

20 As you probably also know, in May of this year the  
21 Commission decided that an environmental assessment would be  
22 needed to operate that system even though no discharges from the  
23 cleanup water were needed.

24 It took several months to prepare the environmental  
25 assessment. It was made public. Public comments were received,

1 and in October of this year the Commission authorized that the  
2 process be allowed to proceed but that all of the water contained  
3 therein would have to be held onsite pending a further assessment  
4 and all waste generated by that process would need to be  
5 solidified before they were shipped offsite.

6 Then on November the 21st the Commission came out with  
7 a policy statement, something that had been in the works for a  
8 number of months, but basically the policy statement said that  
9 a programmatic environmental impact statement would be prepared  
10 for the decontamination and cleanup process.

11 Now the statement will address all of the activities  
12 that have occurred to date and all of the activities that would  
13 be contemplated until the facility is in a cleaned up state.  
14 The statement will not address other things such as  
15 decommissioning of the facility or reconstruction of the  
16 facility. It will only deal with the cleanup process.

17 The options and various alternatives to the cleanup  
18 will be discussed in this statement. Hopefully these will be  
19 laid out clearly and the environmental impact of the various  
20 alternatives and options will be stated.

21 In general, there won't be any conclusions but rather  
22 a discussion of ways of cleaning it up and the impacts of these  
23 cleanup methods.

24 Eventually Metropolitan Edison will be opposing  
25 optional systems or specific systems I should say, for cleaning

1 up various parts of the facility.

2           These systems then will be evaluated based on the  
3 results of the environmental assessment, and if the environmental  
4 assessment or the environmental appraisal does not cover the  
5 scope of the activity that is being proposed, then supplements  
6 to that environmental statement would need to be prepared.

7           Hopefully, we will be able to address in sufficient  
8 breadth all of the activities that are needed to clean up the  
9 facility, including the disposition of the wastes that will be  
10 generated by the cleanup.

11           I know that the incidents of the past couple of days  
12 will prompt a great many comments, but I would like to try to  
13 focus, at least initially in the meeting, on the real purpose  
14 of this, and the purpose of this is again to try to build as  
15 good a structure for the preparation of this programmatic  
16 environmental statement as possible. And for that purpose we  
17 need the input that you can give us and that is the responsibility  
18 that we have and that is what we are here for.

19           I don't, I am not trying to slough off and won't slough  
20 off questions dealing with the events of the past couple of  
21 days or whatever else you would like to talk about, but I would  
22 like to forego those types of things until we have dealt with the  
23 issues on the environmental impact statement.

24           The people at the table, the gentleman closest to me,  
25 I am sure most of you know, John Collins, who is Deputy Director

1 for Three Mile Island Support, and is in charge of the operational  
2 activities onsite and also mans the newly created office in  
3 Middletown several days a week.

4 To Mr. Collins' left is Daniel Muller who is Deputy  
5 Director of the Division of Site Safety and Environmental  
6 Analysis, and it is his division that is responsible for the  
7 preparation of the programmatic environmental impact statement.

8 To his left is Donald Sells, who is Acting Chief in  
9 one of the environmental projects branches; it will be partly  
10 his responsibility and his branch to manage the activities that  
11 go into the production of the environmental impact statement.

12 I would like Mr. Sells now to briefly go over the  
13 scope of the statement as we currently see it, so you will know  
14 what we have in mind, the items we think should be covered and  
15 will be covered. These statements are available to you and also  
16 the Commission's policy statement of May 21st will also be  
17 available to you.

18 So, Donald?

19 MR. SELLS: Thank you. As Mr. Vollmer has indicated,  
20 I represent the office within NRC that has the responsibility  
21 of preparing, the immediate responsibility of preparing the  
22 impact statement.

23 Before I go any further I would like to introduce the  
24 two senior environmental project managers who are working  
25 specifically on this project. At the front table, Mr. Oliver



1 Lynch and near the microphone Mr. Paul Leech. And both of these  
2 project managers have extensive experience in the preparation  
3 of environmental statements and are working essentially full  
4 time on scoping and supervising the preparation of this  
5 particular statement.

6 Mr. Vollmer covered many of the points that I had  
7 originally planned on covering, so I will only hit a few  
8 additional highlights and then briefly cover the outline as it  
9 was proposed and slightly modified on January 11th.

10 As you all know, under the requirements of the National  
11 Environmental Policy Act we are required to issue environmental  
12 impact statements whenever a major federal action occurs or  
13 whenever the Commission decides that it is appropriate. And  
14 this is the case where the Commission has decided that it is  
15 appropriate to do an environmental impact statement.

16 Our procedures call for the development of a draft  
17 statement, issuing of that statement for comment to the public,  
18 to federal, state and local agencies and to interest groups.

19 This comment period normally is a 45-day period which  
20 can be and is fortunately always extended to 60 days. It is  
21 extended on request of any agency or any individual.

22 At the completion of the comment period the comments  
23 are compiled. We have the responsibility of addressing all the  
24 comments. We append the comments to the draft, modify the text  
25 of the draft as appropriate and provide comments on all of these

1 comments to the draft statement and issue it then as the final  
2 environmental statement.

3 This becomes the basis of the NRC staff positions on  
4 environmental issues.

5 Just to briefly highlight a couple of the remarks  
6 that Mr. Vollmer said or mentioned, the policy statement issued  
7 on the 21st of November of last year by the Commission and  
8 noticed in the Federal Register on November 27th called for the  
9 preparation of a programmatic statement dealing with the  
10 decontamination and disposal of waste of Unit Two, and that is  
11 our purpose.

12 The scope includes all activities that have occurred  
13 to date and all activities that may be associated with that  
14 decontamination and disposal through the cleanup of the reactor  
15 coolant system, the primary system itself.

16 That means decontamination of the reactor building,  
17 removal of the core, cleanup of the primary coolant and cleanup  
18 of the primary coolant system.

19 It is not our intent nor are we directed to go beyond  
20 the cleanup stage. Any further activities that might be  
21 associated with Unit Two are licensee decisions that must be  
22 made at some point in the future and themselves would be subject  
23 of NRC review and quite likely additional environmental impact  
24 statements.

25 We are hopeful that by utilizing the scoping meetings

1 and the expertise which we are currently getting from Argonne  
2 National Laboratory to prepare this statement that we can in  
3 fact develop a statement that will cover the options in sufficient  
4 depth that we will not have to issue supplements.

5 But the Commission in its policy statement recognizes  
6 that each step of the decontamination will develop information  
7 that will have a bearing on the succeeding steps.

8 And it may well be that before the final process is  
9 jelled and before the final process is agreed upon that we will  
10 in fact have to issue supplements to the final statement. This  
11 is planned and this will be done where it is necessary.

12 Again let me emphasize that our specific purpose and  
13 objective here tonight is to hear your opinions on the document.  
14 Those of you who received invitations received along with that  
15 invitation a copy of the outline. There are additional copies  
16 of the outline on the front table which I should have mentioned  
17 earlier, and I apologize. But they are available for your use.

18 So we welcome your comments tonight. We welcome your  
19 comments at any time subsequent to this meeting and you can make  
20 those comments in writing, preferably by dropping them off in  
21 the mail to us in Washington or dropping them off in the  
22 Middletown office. I am sure that Mr. Collins will see that they  
23 are passed immediately to us if you have comments on the scope  
24 and outline of the statement.

25 Before we proceed with the open discussion I would like

1 to briefly go over the outline as it is presented and slightly  
2 modified due to some comments received from internal staff since  
3 January 10.

4 For those of you who have copies of the outline you  
5 will read, recognize that there are a few modifications. The  
6 depth of the document we feel has not been altered by the  
7 slight modifications that have been made.

8 Let's go on to the next part of the program.

9 As indicated, the purpose of the preparation is to  
10 assist the NRC in carrying out its responsibilities. And since  
11 the slide is on the screen I am not going to read every word of  
12 what it says. But we ought to engage the public and the  
13 Commission's decisionmaking process and to focus on environmental  
14 issues and alternatives before commitments to cleanup choices  
15 are made.

16 The next slide shows the major chapters of the  
17 programmatic environmental impact statement as we currently  
18 envision it.

19 I will go through each of these chapters very briefly,  
20 so I will not dwell on this particular slide or viewgraph except  
21 to say that you can see there are twelve chapters. It is broken  
22 down basically in the scheme of things that are occurring or have  
23 occurred, things that still must be done that have not been  
24 formerly requested in terms of activities, and then a look at the  
25 combined effects that might be anticipated from the various

1 alternatives. And then at the last, any conclusions that we  
2 might draw.

3 Chapter One, which deals with the introduction, again  
4 addresses basically the scope of the statement, a brief  
5 description of the plant and its history, a discussion, a  
6 brief discussion of the March 1979 accident, and the releases  
7 that occurred, at and during the time of the accident; a summary  
8 of the licensee's objectives and the proposed actions and his  
9 schedule; and what issues in controversy relative to the proposed  
10 actions that we can identify and with your help we hope that we  
11 will be able to identify all of these issues, to clearly call  
12 them out in Chapter One.

13 Chapter Two deals with a description of the major  
14 alternatives associated with the cleanup, first with the  
15 decontamination of the facility, and it is dealing with no  
16 action to full contamination required for future decisions  
17 relative to the disposition of the facility.

18 And the second part of that chapter, and this is a  
19 slight wording change, organizational change, than what you will  
20 see in the January 10th outline that you have, the second portion  
21 of this chapter deals with the disposal of the wastes and dealing  
22 with both onsite and offsite disposal.

23 The third chapter deals with the population and the  
24 environment which may be affected. And I notice a spelling error  
25 in the slide right away in reading it right now.

1           This is basically a description of Three Mile Island  
2 and the vicinity of Three Mile Island. It is a description that  
3 will be very similar to what was given in the final environmental  
4 statement for the operating license for Three Mile Island.

5           In addition, it is our intent to describe to some  
6 degree and in some detail a description of the transportation  
7 routes over which wastes may be shipped.

8           We will also be discussing in some detail a description  
9 of down-river demography. By that I mean down more toward  
10 Maryland and the Chesapeake Bay itself, because we have had  
11 meetings with Maryland and they have expressed great concern  
12 about the potential discharges. So we will be addressing that  
13 also.

14           Chapter Four is proposed action activities completed  
15 on process such as the cleanup in the auxiliary building, the  
16 water in the auxiliary building tanks using EPICOR. Anything  
17 that we feel are activities that will be completed on progress  
18 we will put in this chapter, recognizing that this is a living  
19 process and some of the things that we may have in Chapter Five,  
20 which are things in the future, may move up to Chapter Four and  
21 vice versa. But we have tried to make a breakout at this stage  
22 showing a discussion of those things that have occurred or we  
23 expect that might occur between now and December.

24           And Chapter Five then, the next slide, goes on to what  
25 happens beyond that point, starting with a separate chapter

1 on decontamination of the reactor containment building itself.

2 Building atmosphere cleanup, initial entry, some of  
3 which you have seen in the paper is activities that are planned.  
4 At some quarter, basement water cleanup and decontamination of  
5 the surface areas and containment, process and storage of the  
6 wastes from this decontamination process.

7 Chapter Six will then go on into the events that will  
8 lead to reactor examination, pressure vessel opening and core  
9 removal. Cleanup of the primary coolant system water and  
10 decontamination of the reactor coolant system, the primary  
11 system.

12 And again, process and storage of waste from the  
13 reactor, decontamination.

14 I guess I had better back up and say reactor coolant  
15 system decontamination itself will be a subject of a separate  
16 chapter, and this is reflected in Chapter Seven.

17 Chapter Eight will deal with all those facilities  
18 that will be built in support of the decontamination operation,  
19 facilities that would be built, and later, after decontamination  
20 is complete, must be dismantled or disposed of in some manner.  
21 In many cases facilities that themselves will become somewhat  
22 contaminated.

23 Chapter Eight is devoted exclusively to discussing  
24 these facilities.

25 Chapter Nine will focus principally on the shipment of

1 fuel and solid waste to disposal sites or other facilities. It  
2 will address the question of material to be shipped, the form  
3 of the materials to be shipped, the shipment resources required,  
4 disposal resources required. This means low level storage  
5 areas, low level burial grounds, high level waste disposal  
6 requirements and the environmental impacts that are associated  
7 with this disposal.

8 Chapters 10 and 11 are summaries of all of the  
9 preceding chapters, essentially. We want to go back and  
10 summarize in a single chapter the combined environmental  
11 consequences of the decontamination. And in Chapter 11 we want  
12 to evaluate the decontamination and waste storage, transport,  
13 and disposal activities in one chapter. These chapters will be  
14 essentially the bottom line chapters. They will provide,  
15 hopefully, a concise account of the impacts that may be  
16 associated with the various alternatives associated with the  
17 decontamination and waste disposal process.

18 And in Chapter 12 we will address any conclusions that  
19 we may reach as a result of this evaluation.

20 We anticipate a number of appendices to this document.  
21 Certainly one of the appendices will be verbatim copies of any  
22 comments, written comments that we receive on the draft  
23 statement. This is a procedure that we have always followed  
24 and we will follow in this document.

25 They will be appended as an appendix to the document.



1           We will provide any environmental assessments that may  
2 be developed that are pertinent to the evaluation. These are  
3 assessments, special studies that may be conducted by Argonne  
4 National Laboratory or one of its subcontractors and will  
5 involve technical study reports as well as impact assessments.

6           And we will also provide in the appendix a listing  
7 of contributors to the EIS.

8           At this point I would like to conclude my remarks and  
9 turn the meeting back over to Mr. Vollmer to answer any questions  
10 that you may have on the impact statement and accept any comments  
11 which you may have.

12           Again we are taking a verbatim transcript of this  
13 proceeding, this meeting, so that we can be certain that when  
14 we get back to Washington we will have your thoughts and we will  
15 be able to make sure that we understand them.

16           Thank you very much.

17           MR. VOLLMER: Thank you, Don. What I would like to  
18 do as far as the format here is pretty much the way it was  
19 handled at the Forum in Harrisburg. I would first like to call  
20 for any comments or statements that any of the state or local  
21 officials would like to give us. I note Al Reid is in the  
22 audience and I think a number of other of the local officials.  
23 We would welcome their comments and suggestions, and following  
24 that I would want to turn over to whoever else would like to make  
25 a statement and give us their suggestions.

1 I already have requests from a representative of the  
2 League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania, and I would like to have  
3 her give her statement after any of the local officials.

4 So may I have some volunteers, any local officials  
5 that would like to make a statement, give us their comments.

6 Mr. Mayor? No?

7 Well, I guess then perhaps if the League of Women  
8 Voters would like to start the ball rolling, Joan Ghiselin --  
9 I hope I pronounced that right -- has requested to make a  
10 statement that has been prepared by the League, and I note also  
11 has the concurrence of the Maryland League of Women Voters.

12 STATEMENT OF JOAN GHISELIN

13 MS. GHISELIN: Some of the areas that we cover in our  
14 statement have been covered by you. We based this on the original  
15 outline that we got earlier.

16 My name is Joan Ghiselin. I am the energy director  
17 of the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania. We hope a copy  
18 of the EIS for comment when it is completed, as well as  
19 notification of any hearings that are to be held on procedures  
20 that the NRC may deem necessary before completion of the EIS.

21 The League recognizes that the outline is just that,  
22 a proposed methodology, but we suggest that certain areas be  
23 included in the study.

24 The geographic area should include the downwind and  
25 downstream areas to the extent that they will probably be

1 affected by any releases. This area would include the  
2 Chesapeake Bay and different land areas depending on seasonal  
3 wind pattern.

4 The proposed management plan should include a central  
5 agency which would receive and correlate all air, water, and  
6 biotic monitoring data, and that information should be available  
7 to the public for its inspection.

8 Thermometers utilized should be calibrated so that  
9 measures obtained include the full range from zero to infinity.

10 Since it is evident that with the best possible  
11 supervision and intent accidents and unforeseen incidents  
12 occur, all programmed activities must be assumed to function  
13 at the least level of efficiency with maximum potential for  
14 human error. Only under these conditions should releases that  
15 are deemed necessary and least harmful be planned.

16 Any such releases must be kept to an absolute minimum,  
17 not simply to some standard establishes perhaps acceptable.

18 Paragraph 3, page 1 of the EIS outline should include  
19 the following. Geology should be addressed both as relevant  
20 to hydrology and to storage of waste material at the site.  
21 Health effects should be included as a separate item.

22 Ecological studies should include food chains and  
23 possible cumulative effects on the biota of the affected areas,  
24 both terrestrial and marine.

25 Independent sources should be consulted in determining

1 which of the various alternative methods should be used at  
2 various stages in the proposed management plan.

3 The bibliography should include the methods, designs,  
4 and authorities considered. It is extremely important that the  
5 public be assured that every possible safeguard is in place.

6 These should include security, methods and restrictions  
7 of releases, as well as absolute amounts of such releases.

8 A separate chapter or appendix should deal with what  
9 are determined to be acceptable levels of radioactive or toxic  
10 emissions.

11 The bibliography should delineate on what basis such  
12 a decision is made. I would like to thank you for the opportunity  
13 to testify, and as you know, the League of Women Voters of  
14 Maryland is concurring in our statement.

15 Thank you. If you have any questions.

16 MR. VOLLMER: Thank you very much, Ms. Ghiselin. I  
17 think these will be very helpful for us. They are very specific  
18 and to the point, and this is to the extent possible the type  
19 of comments that we will be able to use and find most  
20 beneficial.

21 I guess there is nobody else been asked to specifically  
22 make a statement or comment, so I will go according to a show  
23 of hands for the next person.

24 (Pause.)  
25

\*\*\*\*\*

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

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

## STATEMENT OF DR. MICHAEL BENKO

DR. BENKO: My name is Dr. Michael Benko, B-e-n-k-o. I have a statement from Mr. Andrew Burger, who is a Third Ward Middletown councilman. This is Mr. Burger's statement concerning krypton release. The reason he is not here is his company sent him out of town.

It has almost been a year since central Pennsylvania was one-half to one hour away from a core meltdown. A core meltdown until this point was said to be impossible.

Ironically, this worst of all nuclear accidents occurred in the United States, the technological leader of the world. Officials throughout central Pennsylvania were perplexed as to what action to take concerning an evacuation.

Met Ed told local and state officials that no radiation was escaping when in fact there were uncontrolled releases occurring the very same day.

It is interesting to note that ten years previous the AEC suggested that Penn Elec, a sister company to Met Ed, install stack monitors that could better measure larger releases of radiation at its Saxton, Pa. plant. If the proper stack monitors were at TMI the radiation could have been measured.

Officials were accused of unnecessary evacuation, unfortunately, or maybe fortunately for Met Ed, we didn't know and we will never know how much radiation was released into our atmosphere.

1                   As we all know, there is a large population around  
2 TMI.    Within a ten-mile radius there is 121,000 people.  As a  
3 matter of fact, TMI has the sixth largest population within  
4 ten miles among the nation's 72 licensed reactors.

5                   There is a method to slow down a core meltdown by  
6 placement of large blocks of magnesium oxide under the reactor  
7 vessel, under the reactor pressure vessel to slow the effects  
8 of the meltdown to the steel and concrete basin, the containment,  
9 and into the earth.

10                  This would give the population more time to evacuate.  
11 There was space built in beneath the pressure vessels at plants  
12 like Indian Point and Zion.  Will the population area of central  
13 Pennsylvania get the extra precautionary benefit of safety at  
14 TMI?

15                  The answer is no.  The typical answer when we talk  
16 about Met Ed and safety.

17                  Many people evacuated during the TMI accident.  After  
18 reading the fact that TMI was a near nuclear catastrophe, how  
19 can anyone argue with this logical action?  However, many of these  
20 people weren't financially reimbursed.  It is clear evidence  
21 that Met Ed will not face up to its moral and financial  
22 obligations.

23                  Many people have had medical treatment because of  
24 psychological stress.  They have never been reimbursed, because  
25 according to the nuclear industry, psychological help does not

1 count.

2 One of three basic rights of our Constitution is the  
3 pursuit of happiness. This right has a serious setback for many  
4 of my neighbors in Middletown. It wasn't bad enough that Met Ed  
5 had an accidental release. Now they openly admit they want to  
6 have a release on purpose.

7 This is a release of krypton that could also include  
8 isotopes of strontium and cesium if not handled properly. It is  
9 a release that could cause a large accumulation of krypton gas  
10 in someone's basement.

11 The dangerous gamma rays could come up through the  
12 basement and through the cells of innocent little children.  
13 Years later those children could get cancer or children  
14 could have serious birth defects.

15 It only takes common sense to realize that venting  
16 the krypton gas is the most economical method, as Bob Arnold  
17 stated.

18 We all know that it is highly unusual that the cheapest  
19 way is the safest way. The sobering fact is that Met Ed hasn't  
20 started to develop any safe alternatives to get rid of the  
21 krypton gas.

22 If they are not forced to start these safe methods  
23 immediately it could be too late.

24 They very well might have to vent because the seals  
25 may become weak.

1           The NRC is playing right into the hands of Met Ed  
2 by not making them pick a safe method now. It would be an  
3 opportunity for the NRC to show the people that they really  
4 care about the health and safety of the people. It is about time  
5 the NRC makes Met Ed a responsible, safe nuclear operator rather  
6 than a bunch of wild nuclear cowboys.

7           This year Middletown plans to open a community swimming  
8 pool. Many of the parents, especially with small children, will  
9 not use this pool if krypton gas is purposely released into the  
10 atmosphere.

11           Mothers will be trapped in their home out of fear of  
12 this krypton gas being released. It is ironic that this fear  
13 isn't inflicted by the Russians or Iranians but by fellow  
14 Americans from Met Ed.

15           Why should our townspeople not feel the same safety  
16 people in other areas of this country have?

17           Thomas Jefferson put no asterisk in our Constitution  
18 that the nuclear industry could interfere with the people's  
19 pursuit of happiness.

20           It is time that the nuclear industry follow the same  
21 rules and regulations that other industries do.

22           I am asking the NRC once and for all to supervise the  
23 cleanup of TMI in a manner that will be least harmful medically,  
24 including psychologically to my family and neighbors in  
25 Middletown.



1                   And that was Andy Burger's statement. Andy was just  
2 elected Third Ward councilman. His sole campaign issue was  
3 antinuclear. I just thought that might be interesting to you.

4                   MR. VOLLMER: Okay, Dr. Benko, did Mr. Burger have  
5 any suggestions or was that in one suggestion there?

6                   DR. BENKO: You mean about the cleanup?

7                   MR. VOLLMER: As far as the cleanup, the decontamination,  
8 the process itself or the specific impacts to be addressed?

9                   DR. BENKO: There is a condensation process you can  
10 use, I believe, right?

11                   MR. VOLLMER: Pardon?

12                   DR. BENKO: There is a condensation process that you  
13 can use.

14                   MR. VOLLMER: All right.

15                   DR. BENKO: But you have to -- I think that is what  
16 he was getting at.

17                   I have a statement of my own.

18                   MR. VOLLMER: Okay, well, let me just point out that  
19 you are quite right, that the NRC is looking at any Point  
20 Zion stations with respect to the mitigation of potential melt-  
21 down accidents.

22                   These, some of these types of contentions are already  
23 in the hearing process for the restart of Three Mile Island One  
24 and I wouldn't want to say on the outcome, but certainly these  
25 considerations are foremost in the mind and also the fact that

1 the Three Mile Island facilities do have a relatively high  
2 population zone. They are certainly not -- you know, it has not  
3 escaped the notice of the Commission.

4 As far as the psychological stress issue, that is  
5 another issue that is before the hearing board on the restart  
6 of Three Mile Island One. The board has not given its  
7 recommendation to the Commission regarding how to proceed on  
8 that.

9 As far as the seal leakage is concerned, you mentioned  
10 that Metropolitan Edison has been using this as an issue to  
11 precipitate further or quicker action on venting of krypton or  
12 some nature, or some of the other cleanup processes. I want  
13 to point out for the record that we don't at this time, we the  
14 NRC do not see any need to expedite any of these cleanup  
15 processes, including disposition of the krypton because of any  
16 particular or imminent danger of the krypton gas or the  
17 radioactive materials in the facility.

18 So I can assure you that that, while we do have concern  
19 that it is appropriate to get on with the cleanup job as  
20 expeditiously as safely possible, we don't see imminent danger  
21 because it is sitting there from seal leakage or the nature of  
22 that.

23 Okay, you wanted to make a statement?

24 DR. BENKO: Yes.

25 I have a term that I used to describe the NRC and

1 Met Ed's handling of the TMI accident. That phase, or phrase,  
2 is called "the blunder continues."

3 The daily release of krypton into our air continues.  
4 The insane desire of Met Ed to vent the highly radioactive  
5 krypton into our air continues. Radiation has an accumulative  
6 effect.

7 A threefold infant mortality around the Peach Bottom  
8 plant in the path of radioactive gasses during the March  
9 accidents are areas of deep concern.

10 Genetic mutation does not usually affect exposed  
11 individuals but it affects the health of all subsequent  
12 generations.

13 The safe and sane cleanup of TMI must be forced upon  
14 Met Ed and the NRC. This very astute group, the NRC, and Met  
15 Ed have shown their deep concern by first denying the venting  
16 of krypton into our atmosphere and then admitting that an  
17 insignificant amount of gas was released Monday.

18 These groups will probably blame the press for  
19 overplaying the latest accident.

20 I remember the politicians who blamed the press when  
21 so many of my generation were fighting a way in a place called  
22 Vietnam. I also remember a man who accused the news media of  
23 undue pressure and lies. His name was Richard Nixon, past  
24 President.

25 Let us not allow the NRC or Met Ed or a Madison Avenue

1 PR firm to decide our fate. Let us remain strong-willed, and  
2 determined to bring about the safe cleanup of TMI.

3 I had learned of the release of krypton Monday by a  
4 long-distance phone call from a friend. At the same time Met Ed  
5 was publicly denying by radio that there was a release.

6 It is evident that you cannot believe or trust Met  
7 Ed. Personally I would like to see Met Ed's license to operate  
8 a nuclear plant revoked. I also think that TMI should cease  
9 to operate as a nuclear facility.

10 For the safety of ourselves and our children let us  
11 fight to keep TMI closed. There are alternatives in  
12 Pennsylvania. We have abundant coal resources.

13 Again we must remain strong and determined to bring  
14 about the safe and complete shutdown and dismantling of TMI's  
15 nuclear facility.

16 The Price-Anderson Act allowed insurance for the  
17 nuclear industry. The government backed the insurance with our  
18 tax dollars.

19 In essence, we are paying for Met Ed's continuing  
20 blunder.

21 We have the right to demand a complete shutdown of  
22 TMI's nuclear plant. Over my history of education period, I  
23 always thought my peers were meant to look up to. That view has  
24 changed.

25 Mr. Collins, I asked you several questions, I think,

1 two weeks ago. I believe -- -- answer ' , then you did a 15-  
2 minute dissertation that led to no answer. And every time I  
3 talk to a group from NRC I get the same, I feel the same  
4 runaround.

5 I will answer your two questions. You remember the  
6 first one, I said why did we cease dropping nuclear waste in the  
7 ocean. Well, I think the containers are breaking after about  
8 five years. The Atomic Energy Commission was dropping them.

9 So the progress we have made -- this article was  
10 written in 1957 that there were going to be better ways to store  
11 nuclear wastes. We have taken them and buried them on land  
12 sites that are being contaminated. Containers are breaking.

13 The other point I asked you about was the facility  
14 in Buffalo. Okay, it is a highly radioactive containments that  
15 are broke and leaking. And I think the estimate is one to two  
16 billion dollars to clean that up.

17 What the NRC wanted to do, or the government, whoever  
18 it be, they wanted to continue the use of that as a storage  
19 site, as a power to clean it up. Okay, so it was a bargain  
20 rate.

21 Right now, as you stated, some litigations with New  
22 York State.

23 My one concern at this point is, will the NRC allow  
24 Met Ed -- now they have the desire to start Unit One up. Unit  
25 Two is not controlled. You are having one hell of a time down

1 there. Would you allow them to start that plant with what you  
2 have down there now?

3 MR. VOLLMER: Would Unit One be allowed to start up  
4 with Unit Two in the condition it is in?

5 DR. BENKO: Would you as a group -- the startup --  
6 in an emergency state right now?

7 MR. VOLLMER: I don't know what decision is going to  
8 be made as far as the startup of Unit One. As you probably --

9 DR. BENKO: Well, you men are the men --

10 MR. VOLLMER: No, wait, let me finish.

11 DR. BENKO: You men are the ones that make the  
12 decisions, and you have to have some opinion on that.

13 MR. VOLLMER: The Commission order as far as the  
14 technical issues to be addressed specified that one of the  
15 items to be considered in the hearing which you are probably  
16 well aware is that the facilities be physically separated or  
17 environmentally separated so that activities and malfunctions,  
18 incidents, or whatever you want to call it, such as happened  
19 Monday, would not affect Unit One.

20 If that can be demonstrated, and if the Commission  
21 decides on other issues that Unit One could be operated, then the  
22 answer would be from a licensing point of view yes.

23 DR. BENKO: One more question. That would be  
24 physically impossible, I believe, they are so proximal. The  
25 NRC approves the site of a nuclear facility, and it okays its

1 completion.

2 The men that made the judgment to put a nuclear plant  
3 right on the final approach of an active airport that has  
4 heavy, wide-bodied jets --

5 (Applause.)

6 I am -- -- at my applause. There is no way that you  
7 can almost avoid coming close to it.

8 You men have made a lot of bad decisions, and I think  
9 it is time to get your act together.

10 (Applause.)

11 And may you accept some of the responsibility that  
12 you should. I don't think you have done a good job. You have  
13 got a chance to do one now.

14 Thank.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. VOLLMER: Is this a comment on the environmental  
17 impact statement?

18 (inaudible)

19 MR. VOLLMER: Okay, if it has to do with the  
20 environmental impact statement, sure.

21 (Pause.)

22 All right, I recognize you, sir. But would you give  
23 your name out and spell it for the transcriber.

24 MR. MANIK: Al Manik, M-a-n-i-k.  
25

\*\*\*\*\*  
1 STATEMENT OF AL MANIK:

2 MR. MANIK: Gentlemen, we have a problem with the  
3 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and a utility, namely Met Ed.  
4 Now the problem with the NRC stems from the first time we met.  
5 I thought I could have some faith in a government organization  
6 that would and should be receptive to the wants and needs of a  
7 good people in the area.

8 Besides appearing before the NRC here and elsewhere I  
9 was promised an answer to my questions, or problems as they call  
10 them, as I presented them to the NRC.

11 I presented the list of grievances to the NRC panel  
12 in Hershey in November. The moderator then promised me he would  
13 have an answer to these problems immediately. Now that is a long,  
14 long time since November. I suppose that I still am promised  
15 an answer.

16 May I ask you how we could evacuate the area  
17 effectively? What would you do with the sick people? What would  
18 you do with the ambulances? Who would provide protective  
19 clothing and so forth? I am waiting for my first answer, and  
20 this is just as important as an impact statement. It is more  
21 important. That is our lives.

22 Now what would you do with the krypton gas? Maybe  
23 it would drive your cars. Perhaps we could sell it at a dollar  
24 a gallon and possibly cause cancer on a lesser or greater scale,  
25 who knows?



1           Now let's talk about Met Ed and every liability.  
2 Perhaps a few pictures in the paper and print will tell a story,  
3 so I am donating to you people a newspaper better known as a  
4 Guide to the NRC that tells the story, shows you the pictures of  
5 how, when, where, and why of your proud utility that I presume  
6 you came here to defend.

7           Please give me an answer to the list of questions I  
8 am presenting to the NRC for the third time.

9           Thank you.

10          (Applause.)

11          MR. VOLLMER: Mr. Manik, had you submitted those  
12 questions in a written form?

13          MR. MANIK: I talked to a panel.

14          MR. VOLLMER: What panel is that, Mr. Manik?

15          MR. MANIK: The panel in Hershey the 16th of November.

16          MR. VOLLMER: Was that the hearing board?

17          MR. MANIK: I spoke to a panel the 16th of November,  
18 1979 in Hershey in the Little Theater. I presented these  
19 questions, and, believe me, you want to know why your credibility  
20 is as low as it is, take a look.

21          MR. VOLLMER: Well, Mr. Manik --

22          MR. MANIK: I will give you the questions.

23          MR. VOLLMER: Okay, I would be glad to have them, but  
24 the panel that you presented them to was the hearing board who  
25 will be conducting the hearing for the Three Mile Island One

1 startup, and they were receiving public statements, and I don't  
2 believe that they generally are able to respond if those  
3 statements contain specific questions. Is that right, Steve?

4 It is very difficult for them to respond to all these  
5 activities but if you would like to give them to me in whatever  
6 form you have them, I will try to make sure they are answered  
7 correctly and properly.

8 MR. MANIK: Not only that I sent a copy to Congressman  
9 Earle, Senator Heinz, Senator Sweicker, Senator Hart, Lieutenant  
10 Governor Scranton. I am still waiting for my first answer.  
11 Would you believe that?

12 MR. VOLLMER: Well, why don't you give me a try.  
13 I will try to.

14 MR. MANIK: Thank you.

15 MR. VOLLMER: Yes, please?

16 STATEMENT OF MARY OSBORN

\*\*\*\*\*  
17 MS. OSBORN: My name is Mary Osborn, O-s-b-o-r-n. I  
18 have never spoken before a group like this before, and I do not  
19 understand the thing about the krypton. By the time you take  
20 action this whole thing will have burped, and I just cannot  
21 understand if the thing is so unimportant to you people why don't  
22 you do us a favor and dispose of it right away and properly.  
23 We cannot take three months of little burps. It is driving  
24 everybody I know crazy. Even my children and even my husband,  
25 who doesn't really care what is going on.

1                   Now another thing. I am worried about the krypton  
2 because I plant a garden, and every time the wind blows from  
3 Three Mile to my vicinity, I panic because I do not know what  
4 is coming in the wind.

5                   I am really disgusted with it. I have a freezer half  
6 full of vegetables from last year that I have not even started  
7 to eat yet because I am afraid. I do not know what was in it.

8                   And I want to know what standards or guidelines are  
9 you going to use for this impact statement you have.

10                  And I want to know if you people have read the  
11 Heidelberg Report and does that have any effect on how you people  
12 do your business.

13                  Last night I went to see Senator Heinz, and he called  
14 Met Ed and the NRC liars, and he said it about, there were about  
15 100 people in the audience, and I know some of them here tonight,  
16 and he said it, and I am calling him Thursday to see what he is  
17 going to do about the things people said to him last night.

18                  Because we are really fed up and disgusted. We come  
19 here, everybody comes here. Every time I see a new face on TV  
20 I really get choked up because I never realize that there are  
21 more people than I know that really care about this. And all  
22 you people do is write it, make reports, and take your good old  
23 time. And then we have a little burp and a little water leak  
24 there. And it is really disgusting.

25                  Plus I have to see you later, Mr. -- right there, Mr.

1 Collins, because either you lied to me or you just said something  
2 wrong, and it is something, I have it right here.

3 That is it.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. VOLLMER: Well, Ms. Osborn, let me briefly, as  
6 far as your food, I sort of gather from what you said that you  
7 might not be willing to accept what we might state as being the  
8 effect of krypton on your garden, and I guess I would have to ask  
9 you to write to somebody at Penn State if our credibility is  
10 not adequate and ask them or a doctor or something like that.

11 I do believe, however, the food would be certainly  
12 safe to eat.

13 As far as the standards or guidelines that are to be  
14 used in the cleanup process, we would normally apply what are  
15 called Appendix I guidelines to accidental releases.

16 In the case of the cleanup, in all of the activities  
17 that have been taken, that have happened to date since the  
18 accident after the main release of gas in the first four or five  
19 days, the standards that we have been applying to any effluence  
20 from Three Mile Island have been much, much less than these  
21 standards or guidelines that are applied to operating reactors.

22 The Commission in the environmental impact statement  
23 wants us to address whether or not the current guidelines are  
24 satisfactory, and that is something that will be discussed in  
25 that statement.

1           As far as the Heidelberg Report goes, the NRC has  
2 looked into that very deeply. The Commission has asked for a  
3 report on that. The report is being prepared. And if you wish,  
4 when it is available publicly, I could see to it that you get  
5 a copy of our report on that report. I know it is a very  
6 extensive one and it has taken a lot of staff time to prepare.

7           Lastly, I would say that we are very concerned about  
8 the cleanup process. We are very concerned that it is taking  
9 so long. Part of the reason that it is taking so long and is  
10 so frustrating is because it is not clear what standards we  
11 can apply to it or should apply to it.

12           If it were a matter of a contamination in a facility  
13 that had not undergone an accident, the cleanup process would have  
14 been done so a long time ago, and things could have been  
15 disposed of in accordance with current guidelines. But because  
16 of the heightened anxiety about releasing anything we have been  
17 very slow admittedly in proceeding down the cleanup process.

18           I think that what happened Monday is not an uncommon  
19 occurrence in a large industrial facility, and I certainly  
20 could not even think of saying that such an occurrence wouldn't  
21 be likely to happen again, in this year or next year or something  
22 like that.

23           A small leak in a facility is something that is not  
24 an unusual occurrence. I wish I could say that it wouldn't  
25 happen again, but that wouldn't be correct.

1 MS. OSBORN: I have one more thing to say. I feel  
2 that almost any industry should put the air, make it come out  
3 as clean as when it went in. That is the least you people or  
4 any industry could do, and the same way with the water.

5 And I feel that if you cannot do that, you have no  
6 business putting any nuclear plants in operation.

7 Same way with coal if we have to go to coal.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. VOLLMER: Excuse me, I am sorry, I didn't hear the  
10 end there. What was that?

11 MS. OSBORN: I said the same way with coal.

12 MR. VOLLMER: Oh, you feel the same way with coal?  
13 Okay, thank you.

14 MR. MULLER: Ms. Osborn, let me make two comments  
15 relative to the Heidelberg Report. One is that as a result of  
16 the report the staff is recommending to the Commission that we  
17 do modify some of the methods that we do calculations.

18 We have found something, have learned something from  
19 the Heidelberg Report, and we are proposing changes in some of  
20 the assumptions that we use on calculations.

21 In other areas we disagree. But at least one area I  
22 know of we are modifying our procedures.

23 Secondly, with regard to the Heidelberg Report, the  
24 Environmental Protection Agency is independently doing an  
25 evaluation of the report also. I don't know when that will be

1 out but I know they are starting their independent evaluation.

\*\*\*\*\*

2 STATEMENT OF JANE KOHR:

3 MS. KOHR: Hi. I am Jane Kohr with Susquehanna  
4 Valley Alliance. Who are you?

5 Kohr, K-o-h-r.

6 The gentleman who just made the statement about the  
7 Heidelberg Report.

8 MR. VOLLMER: That is Mr. Daniel Muller who is  
9 Deputy Director of the Division of Site Safety and Environmental  
10 Analysis, which as I indicated before, is a division in the NRC  
11 which is responsible for getting together the staff and technical  
12 expertise to prepare the environmental impact statement.

13 MS. KOHR: Okay.

14 The Susquehanna Valley Alliance is based in Lancaster.  
15 We have reviewed the outline of the EIS as it was presented in  
16 Harrisburg and we have a number of comments.

17 First, regarding the basic purpose to engage the  
18 public in decisionmaking, the SVA would insist that the NRC  
19 establish a citizens advisory committee with funding for  
20 independent expert consultants to work with Argonne National  
21 Labs in the preparation of the EIS.

22 We feel that this is the only effective way that we can  
23 have public comment. I mean you can have dozens of meetings  
24 like this over the state, and unless we have expert people in the  
25 fields of nuclear reactor technology, radioactive water treatment,

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 and the money to fund them to give us their opinions, there is  
2 only so much we can do.

3 We also would like to emphasize that the SVA has  
4 already retained a water treatment expert. We have already  
5 presented to the NRC in our technical comments on EPICOR Two  
6 a plan for a three-pronged treatment process involving charcoal  
7 filtration, demineralization, and evaporation.

8 We think that process would work. The reason given  
9 in the environmental adjustment for failure to use such a  
10 program was simply that it was too expensive. Our expert  
11 predicted in those comments the problems that we are having now  
12 with EPICOR Two. And we would like you to take a relook at  
13 Mr. Kusarkus' statements in our technical comments.

14 Secondly, under paragraph number three, population  
15 and environment, we feel that it is extremely important to  
16 include psychological stress. We feel that that is a real  
17 weakness in this outline for the environmental impact statement.

18 In addition, we would emphasize the statement made by  
19 the League of Women Voters on the importance of geology,  
20 particularly in terms of disposition of radioactive wastes on  
21 the island.

22 We think that was a real weak point in the original  
23 environmental assessment. We said so in our comments. And  
24 you know, the parenthesis here, if necessary, is very  
25 disturbing.



1                   Finally, we feel that the failure to include in this  
2 outline the whole problem of the restart of TMI Unit One is a  
3 serious lack in this whole program, that to consider TMI Unit  
4 Two without Unit One is to fail to recognize the geographic  
5 proximity of the two units and their relationship to each  
6 other, particularly in view of the fact that they share some  
7 plumbing and other facilities.

8                   Finally, and most importantly, the fact that NRC and  
9 the Argonne Labs are proceeding to do an environmental impact  
10 statement at this point without telling Met Ed to stop their  
11 proceedings in terms of engaging \$8 million contracts for the  
12 development and installation of the submerged demineralizer  
13 system, we feel is a repeat of the EPICOR Two problem.

14                   While we are considering alternatives, while NRC and  
15 Argonne are considering alternatives, Met Ed has already made  
16 the decision and bought the equipment. And we feel that no  
17 matter what the recommendation of the environmental impact  
18 statement, the decision has already been made, we feel this is  
19 a violation of NEPA, which specifically states that before  
20 an irretrievable commitment of resources is made the environmental  
21 impact statement conclusion should be considered.

22                   Thank you very much.

*Ed  
Report*

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

Tape 2 1  
NRC  
Middletown 2  
2/12/80  
Pritchett/ 3  
Oatfield

MR. VOLLMER: Thank you, Ms. Kohr. I might mention that the citizens advisory committee concept has been brought forth a number of times and I know that some active consideration is being given to that. It is difficult, as you point out, to engage people in a process such as this by holding public meetings, because in many cases they aren't too productive. But I think that there is a real desire on the part of the Commission to prepare a meaningful environmental statement for this process and one which does really reflect the views of everybody involved. So I hope that whatever is done will indeed meet that objective. I appreciate your comments.

Mrs. Lee?

MS. LEE: Gentlemen, I didn't want to speak tonight, but the reason I changed my mind is because you are taping this and, hopefully, it will go to Washington, where they can get some feeling as to what is going on here and how the people in this area feel about the continued operation of TMI-1 and the ongoing accident at TMI-2.

I just completed reading the Rogavin report, volume one. And for those who aren't aware, it is a report, an investigative report, on the accident on TMI on a daily basis as well as the internal problems within the NRC and Met Ed. And in view of the fact that the NRC participated in this investigative report, and if what I have read is even half of the truth, and I suspect that that is the case, then I have serious reservations about

2-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 what is going to happen in the future as far as the clean-up of  
 2 unit two, the desires of the public. We have had hearing after  
 3 hearing since the initial accident. I feel like I am in a  
 4 revolving door attending all these hearings and all these  
 5 meetings, only to learn with each phase of opposition that is  
 6 brought to bear and each protest that is made by the citizenry  
 7 we only find that you relentlessly continue to make decisions  
 8 that do not serve the best interests of the people in this area.

(Applause)

10 The very fact that the NRC has not been able to  
 11 determine at this state whether psychological distress is a  
 12 factor, have, in fact, used psychological approaches to use the  
 13 hearings as a sounding board, let the people get it off of their  
 14 chest, let them spill their spleens, if you will, after they have  
 15 had their say they will go away and it will all die and we will  
 16 bury it, we will bury it like we buried the rest of the acci-  
 17 dents in this country, and it will be all forgotten, it will  
 18 go away. Well, this isn't going to go away. It is obvious that  
 19 it is not going to go away.

20 And I agree with the gentleman who spoke earlier: you  
 21 have got one hell of a job down there. You have got a plant that  
 22 is out of control. You don't know what to do with it. You keep  
 23 putting Band-Aids on it -- but that doesn't solve the problem.

(Applause)

25 The environmental, the tentative outline for the

3-JO

1 environmental study that was submitted here today is meaningless.  
2 It doesn't mean a damn thing -- not to the people here, not to  
3 me. It doesn't mean anything. It is just a lot of words put  
4 together to impress somebody. Well, I am not impressed.

5 (Applause)

6 The communication between the NRC -- and, Mr. Collins  
7 and Mr. Vollmer, you have got my sympathies, believe me -- the  
8 communication between you gentlemen and Washington leaves some-  
9 thing to be desired. You two men sit here and you take our flak  
10 every single day. Well, I tell you, I am getting so angry and  
11 so frustrated. I get telephone calls that women are nearly  
12 hysterical on the phone, crying and saying "What can I do? Where  
13 can I turn?" They are so helpless. You are talking our flak,  
14 but those people in Washington had better start to listen,  
15 because I am telling you one thing, and Lenin said it better  
16 than anybody: You take away a person's home, you threaten their  
17 family, you take away their livelihood, you don't leave them with  
18 anything, even their respect, they can't even die in dignity  
19 because they are going to succumb to cancer -- you take all that  
20 away from a person and you know what you are doing? You are  
21 sowing the seeds of revolution.

22 (Applause)

23 It is not the accident itself. It is all of the other  
24 things piled on top of it. The inflation: that a person goes to  
25 the store every day and they get to the point where they are not

4-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 even able to buy sufficient food for their family. The oil  
2 industry exploiting the people, which is all part and parcel, of  
3 course, of the nuclear industry -- exploiting the people again.

4 How long, how long does the federal government think  
5 that they can go on exploiting the American people, violating the  
6 Constitution of the United States, and get away with it? How  
7 much longer do you think the American people are going to toler-  
8 ate what is going on?

9 They are not going to put up with it. I am telling  
10 you and I am warning you: they are not going to tolerate it.

11 (Applause)

12 Now I have some suggestions and some questions.

13 And one is, I am respectfully requesting the NRC  
14 strategically place monitoring systems on both sides of the  
15 river, instructing private citizens to read those monitors  
16 before any more effort is made to clean up unit two, so that we  
17 know --

18 (Applause)

19 I want those monitors to be acceptable evidence that  
20 any releases that are made and what we are exposed to.

21 VOICE: Right away.

22 MS. LEE: One other thing. I want to see -- in fact,  
23 I demand, and I am sure everybody in this area does -- that  
24 specific communications be set up that Met Ed is required -- and  
25 you have that obligation, gentlemen, to require Met Ed -- to

5-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 notify you immediately, or even prior to the fact, if there is  
2 going to be any radioactive releases, whether it is into the  
3 water or whether it is into the atmosphere. That is the least  
4 that Met Ed can do.

5 (Applause)

6 And that civil defense agencies be notified immediately.  
7 I don't want to hear or see any more foul-ups like we had today.  
8 This is the second time around. And we cannot go on like this.

9 One final thing. I keep hearing every time there is a  
10 release of radioactivity that Mr. Collins or anybody related to  
11 the NRC announces, "Well, there was no danger or any harm to the  
12 public and it was within acceptable limits." Gentlemen, I submit  
13 that most of us don't even know what acceptable limits are --  
14 including many of our medical personnel -- because low-level  
15 radiation is a very new field. But according to Sister Rosalie  
16 Burtell, who is a specialist in this area, low-level radiation  
17 is more dangerous than high-level radiation.

18 I am not going to go into all the ramifications. I  
19 understand it, but I am not going to go into the detail of it.

20 Now, what I want you gentlemen to do, or would like  
21 the NRC to do, is, go back over your records and compile all of  
22 the radioactivity that has been released from that plant, that  
23 these people have been exposed to on a daily basis, compile it,  
24 because we are absorbing that into our systems; it is not going  
25 to go away just because we get a little bit here and a little

6-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 bit here and a little bit there. It is over the long range of  
2 what we are being exposed to that it is going to have the real  
3 impact. And I would like to know. I am getting tired of having  
4 releases from that plant and having the public's intelligence  
5 insulted by saying "However, there was no harm to the public."  
6 The fact that I am not laying here dead on the floor does not  
7 mean that I have not been exposed to something that is going to  
8 cause me cancer ten years down the road.

9 One final thought. It is not a thought, it is a fact.  
10 All of you know -- the NRC knows, Met Ed knows, the Senate knows,  
11 the President of the United States knows, the state legislator  
12 knows, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, they all  
13 know -- that we are experiencing a severe problem with our  
14 animals on the west shore in Etters. I have spoke to every  
15 official that I could think of, including, incidentally, trying  
16 to submit these as contentions before the NRC, who would have  
17 nothing to do with it, and nothing has been done.

18 You talk about an environmental study. I want to know  
19 why when our vet' requested an investigation, through the Agri-  
20 culture Department, to come down there and investigate what is  
21 happening to our animals, nothing was ever done.

22 I don't get a response from any single official. And  
23 I am telling you right now that the report I have is too horren-  
24 dous to believe.

25 I don't care if I am not an expert. We have got enough

7-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-745

1 experts around. The experts got us into this mess in the first  
2 place. I don't have to be an expert to record what is going on  
3 and what is occurring at this time with our animals down there  
4 that is unexplainable; it is unusual. There are people who have  
5 been in the farm business for 60 to 35 years who have never  
6 encountered what is going on down there.

7 You talk about opening unit one. A lot of what is  
8 occurring to the animals happened before the accident and after  
9 the fact, both. We don't know what it is. We are not saying it  
10 is radiation. We don't know. The only thing the vet' will say  
11 is that it began to happen after the plants began to operate.

12 Now, it is your responsibility to come in there and do  
13 an in-depth study.

14 And by the way, if there was no harm to the public, why  
15 is it that Met Ed came in today to test our milk?

16 VOICE: Right.

17 (Applause)

18 MS. LEE: Perhaps they didn't notify you.

19 MR. VOLLMER: Mrs. Lee, you have gone into a lot of  
20 overtime.

21 MS. LEE: I know I am. But I have a lot to say. And I  
22 want it to get back to Washington.

23 (Applause)

24 I want it, Mr. Vollmer, I want it to get back to  
25 Washington. I am not trying to use you and Mr. Collins as a



8-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

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

whipping boy.

MR. VOLLMER: Well --

MS. LEE: But you are the --

MR. VOLLMER: -- there are other people --

MS. LEE: But you are the only one here.

I have one final statement. On Tom Snyder's program, which I mentioned to you last night, Mr. Collins, a quote was taken from a federal official on the fire hazards that the public is confronted with. And he said, "The costs must be weighed against human safety." And I submit to you gentlemen that the people of TMI, in the TMI area, have been made the sacrificial lambs for industrial growth. And to hell with industrial growth. I don't care if this country grows this much. I don't want my family exposed, or anybody else in this area exposed, to any more radiation.

(Applause)

Do you have any questions?

MR. VOLLMER: Well, you are a hard act to follow, Mrs. Lee. But I will just try to respond very specifically to some of the things that you did bring up.

We are looking into the requests that you have made and a number of other people have made about placement of monitors. Although there are monitors on both sides of the river, apparently they are not felt by the citizenry to be in effective spots. And the reason they are there is not to make them

9-JO

1       uneffective. And so we are, we will try to do something promptly  
 2       about that problem. I realize, we fully realize it is a problem;  
 3       it has been pointed out a number of times.

4               As far as the communications that have been set up,  
 5       certainly one of the reasons that this meeting, a transcript is  
 6       being made, is to provide a mode of communication for the people  
 7       that aren't here. Although I was here for many months after the  
 8       accident, I am now part of Washington and I try to carry your  
 9       message back, just as Mr. Muller and Mr. Sells. I think that  
 10      the fact that the message has been carried back and the issue of  
 11      the anxiety and stress from the people in this area concerning  
 12      the release of any radiation is certainly one of the reasons  
 13      that the process is so stagnant and that nothing is being done.

14              It is, one is not able to clean up a facility without  
 15      doing something, and almost everything that is done has a  
 16      potential for release of a small amount, or an amount, of radio-  
 17      activity. And the Commission in response to that has said that  
 18      rather than go ahead and do something, that we will try to do a  
 19      complete assessment of the alternatives, the impacts. And as I  
 20      said before, we don't even have any specific criteria that we are  
 21      using for the clean-up process, because everything that is being  
 22      done is being evaluated on a case-by-case basis, in an effort to  
 23      keep the impacts down to as low as is physically achievable.

24              So I share the frustration, in a sense, with you,  
 25      because I am trying to, and the people here at the site and the

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 people in Washington are trying to, do a conscientious job of  
2 coping with the problems of how to get the facility cleaned up  
3 and yet not do anything which might release a small amount of  
4 radioactivity. It is a very difficult job. And I think some of  
5 the comments that we have had, even from the people, for example,  
6 in the Susquehanna Valley Alliance, would support that fact, that  
7 when you try to clean up a facility, you do have products,  
8 activity products, that have to be dealt with.

9           Lastly, you asked us to compile a record of radioactive  
10 releases. And such a record has been compiled, is being com-  
11 piled, and has been since the accident. Mr. Collins is aware  
12 of all of the activity that has been released since the accident,  
13 as well as the activity released before the accident, from both  
14 units. And that is made available to the public record. And  
15 those reports can be made available to you.

16           I think --

17           MS. LEE: When, Mr. Vollmer? When, Mr. Collins?

18           MR. VOLLMER: The last, well, I guess the --

19           MR. COLLINS: They are submitted on a monthly basis.

20           MR. VOLLMER: They are submitted on a monthly -- you  
21 want to address that, John. You know better.

22           MR. COLLINS: Metropolitan Edison has been required  
23 since the accident to submit to the Commission a summary of all  
24 of their releases on a monthly basis. Those reports are avail-  
25 able, through the public document room. We have copies on the

11-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 island. And I will see that copies of those releases going back  
 2 as far as the 28th are put in the Middletown office, and you are  
 3 welcome to come in and inspect them.

4 MS. LEE: Mr. Collins, one question -- has that been  
 5 compiled into a total figure?

6 THE REPORTER: Ms. Lee, could you go to the mike.

7 MS. LEE: Have those figures been compiled into a total  
 8 figure, so we know what we have been exposed to?

9 MR. COLLINS: I believe, Ms. Lee, they have been  
 10 totaled for a six-month period. And there should be another  
 11 report covering another six-month period.

12 But it would not take very much to compile the data  
 13 past that six-month report and add it onto the six-months. That  
 14 we, and if you want to come in, we are certainly welcome to sit  
 15 down and do that with you.

16 MS. LEE: Do you have the different types of radio-  
 17 active material broken down?

18 MR. COLLINS: Yes, we do.

19 MS. LEE: Okay.

20 MR. COLLINS: Both in water and air. Yes, we do.

21 MS. LEE: All right. Thank you very much.

22 Any more questions?

23 MR. COLLINS: I would like to address one question,  
 24 comment you made, Mrs. Lee, concerning Met Ed's going out and  
 25 monitoring the milk.

12-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 First of all, the radiation that was, small amount that  
 2 was released yesterday was krypton E-5. It is principally the  
 3 only noble gas remaining. That would not participate in the  
 4 milk pathway at all.

5 The monitoring of the milk is a requirement that the  
 6 NRC places on Met Ed, that periodically they must go out and  
 7 buy a sample of milk.

8 MS. LEE: Yes, Mr. Collins, I am well aware of that.

9 MR. COLLINS: It had nothing to do with the release.

10 MS. LEE: Met Ed only collects our milk once a week,  
 11 and that is on Saturdays. It was out of pattern to come today.

12 MR. COLLINS: Well, I certainly can't comment on being  
 13 out of pattern. But I do know that it is a requirement that they  
 14 do it on that basis.

15 MS. LEE: And by the way, it was a requirement before  
 16 the accident but they never were there before the accident.  
 17 They only started after the fact -- then stood and lied before  
 18 the press and said they were there when they weren't. The moni-  
 19 toring of our milk only began after the fact.

20 MR. COLLINS: Well, certainly I will be very happy to  
 21 look into why they came down today and not on a routine basis --

22 MS. LEE: I think that you should.

23 MR. COLLINS: -- that you normally do. I certainly  
 24 will.

25 MS. LEE: After all, somebody has got to keep an eye

13-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

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

on Met Ed.

(Laughter, applause)

MR. VOLLMER: The gentleman with the paper down there.

MR. GARVER: Gentlemen, my name is John Garver. I

live in Middletown, Pennsylvania.

THE REPORTER: Would you spell your last name, please.

MR. GARVER: G-a-r-v-e-r.

I would like to repeat what Jane said. This is a bunch of gobbledegook. Okay?

My statement or input into your environmental impact statement would be to take all your waste and ship it out of this area. Take it and bury it. And leave us in peace.

You can, again, study, study, study and it will mean nothing.

Leave the island the way Met Ed found it -- clean. That is all we ask of you.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. VOLLMER: Well, Mr. Garver, I guess you are as aware as anybody that the whole reason for the statement is to be find what would be the least -- or the most acceptable way of getting the waste out of here. That is certainly the objective of the decontamination and clean-up process. And I hope that by whatever means, if it is not tonight's meeting but if it is with the citizens' committee, or written comments, or whatever,

14-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 that we can get on with that job and do it, do it in the best  
 2 possible way, so that issues such as happened yesterday won't  
 3 happen again.

4 Way in the back, yes?

5 MS. BARLEY: Good evening -- is it on? -- my name is  
 6 Susan Barley, B-a-r-l-e-y. I haven't seen Mr. Vollmer since  
 7 October. The last time I was before the ASLV was in November.  
 8 My situation has changed only slightly in that instead of one cat  
 9 and a dog I have two cats and a dog, according to my limited  
 10 appearance statement. I still ask very simple questions. The  
 11 last time I talked to Mr. Vollmer, all I wanted to know was who  
 12 killed Karen Silkwood. I didn't get an answer.

13 I have a simple question tonight, in that why are we  
 14 using a programmatic approach to the EIS? I was always under  
 15 the assumption that you did it all at once; you didn't do it  
 16 kind of a little bit here and a little bit there. Is this a  
 17 better way of doing it? Do you get better results? Or is this  
 18 maybe something that you started doing since the accident and in  
 19 reaction to the accident? Because I know you are doing it at  
 20 Limerick, too. So that is one question.

21 MR. VOLLMER: Can I answer that first? Okay. I am  
 22 not familiar with the Limerick situation, but I can tell you why  
 23 it is being done here.

24 It is being done here for two reasons. One, the  
 25 information upon which to base the statement at this point in

15-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 time is not completely definitive, because, first of all, the  
 2 licensee has not proposed any specific equipment or processes,  
 3 except for limited items, on which to base the statement.  
 4 Secondly, the condition -- and the easiest example is the fuel  
 5 in the reactor -- the condition of the fuel in the reactor is  
 6 not known to anybody at this time. It won't be known until the  
 7 reactor head is removed and somebody gets in and takes a look  
 8 at it with cameras and TV.

9 So, therefore, we are doing a programmatic statement  
 10 which will try to encompass all those activities. And then when  
 11 we get the specific information, say, on the condition of fuel  
 12 in the reactor, we will be able to look at the specific details  
 13 of doing it and prepare a statement, supplements, as was indi-  
 14 cated by myself and Sells, that perhaps you are more used to.

15 The programmatic thing was not a response to the acci-  
 16 dent. I think it is more a response to the reality of the situ-  
 17 ation.

18 MS. BARLEY: Has it been used before, in other situa-  
 19 tions in other reactors?

20 MR. VOLLMER: I would ask Dan Muller to respond.

21 MR. MULLER: We have not used the programmatic impact  
 22 statement specifically for reactors before. However, the govern-  
 23 ment has used the whole programmatic process in a number of  
 24 different instances on other types of environmental impact  
 25 statements. So it is not an unusual process. And, in fact, the



16-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 CEQ is urging the government to do this type of a statement,  
 2 because they feel, and we agree, that it, once and for all you  
 3 can see the overall impact of an entire activity, rather than  
 4 get it piecemeal, little by little. We think this is a much  
 5 better way of expressing to the public, to you people, what the  
 6 full impact will be of the entire activity.

7 MS. BARLEY: May I continue?

8 MR. VOLLMER: Yes. Let me add on to what he said. The  
 9 Susquehanna Valley Alliance, incidentally, was in their suit  
 10 against the NRC dealing with the use of EPICOR, was very strongly  
 11 in favor of the type of statement that we are preparing, in the  
 12 sense to take a look at the whole process from beginning to end,  
 13 rather than, as Dan said, take piecemeal specific items, because  
 14 it better identifies the whole impact.

15 Okay, go ahead.

16 MS. BARLEY: I also work at Hershey Foods. Please,  
 17 press, don't quote me, don't, not on this. We use an awful lot  
 18 of milk there, something like a million pounds of milk a day.  
 19 Now, since the accident, I have been to California, I have been  
 20 contacted by people in Kentucky, people in Canada, every time I  
 21 go somewhere and tell them that I work at Hershey or I live in  
 22 Hershey, they say, "Oh, my God, it is near the island." That is  
 23 the first thing they say. Then they express their sympathies.  
 24 And then the third thing they want to know is, "Can I eat the  
 25 candy?"

17-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

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

Now, I have a darn good job there, and I like it and I want to keep it. But I just would be very wary of Met Ed just suddenly showing up on my doorstep to test milk when they hadn't done it regularly, or they were out of pattern. Please, can you reassure me? Because, well, you know we have a suit against A&R right now, which is kind of hanging in limbo; it is in court and we can't talk about it. But I like my job and I want to keep it. And I like my cats and my dog. I like my lover, who lives two miles from the island, which is another thing I have to be concerned about. I just want a little more reassurance on the milk.

And please, let me apologize for my very disjointed statement tonight, because last night I had planned to write something down, but yesterday we did have another, minor problem over there, which sort of got me psychologically distressed again -- on the phone till midnight, that sort of thing.

Can you, please, say something?

MR. VOLLMER: I will say something.

MS. BARLEY: Can you be any more reassuring than what you said to Ms. Lee?

MR. VOLLMER: Yes. Okay. Well, yes, I think maybe addressing the milk question a little bit more head-on -- and your statement wasn't disjointed, you got your message across very well -- the facility -- and, again, if you wish to check with somebody more independent than you believe we are, at the

18-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 university, or somebody, they will tell you, as I will, that  
2 there is no longer any -- there is an insignificant amount of  
3 radioactive iodine left in the facility, because in the ten  
4 months since the accident has occurred, each eight days is one  
5 half-life and the activity naturally decays in half, every ten  
6 half-lives the decay goes down by a factor of a thousand, so  
7 that is every 80 days; so after ten or eleven months there just  
8 isn't any left. So I think -- and, in addition to that, the Food  
9 and Drug Administration was very active testing the foods, the  
10 Environmental Protection Agency was very active, as was the NRC  
11 of the state of Pennsylvania, and Department of Energy, in test-  
12 ing milk around the time of the accident. And fortunately, radio-  
13 active iodine was very -- not very much in evidence following the  
14 accident. It was very fortuitous, if you will. It stayed with  
15 the water, which is where most evaluations would expect it to.  
16 But the iodine is no longer there, even if it could get out.

17 The only other thing that, well, I can't think of any-  
18 thing that would really affect milk any more except the radio-  
19 active iodine and since there is none there and neither facility  
20 is operating, then there is just none available for release, none.

21 MS. BARLEY: Okay. I am not real concerned about the  
22 iodine, then. I -- believe it or not -- I do believe you about  
23 the krypton. God knows why. But did anything else come out  
24 yesterday?

25 MR. VOLLMER: The only activity that is in the gaseous

19-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 form in the facility is krypton, and that is left because it has  
2 a ten-and-a-half-year half-life. Anything that comes out of the  
3 facility has to go through four individual high-particulate  
4 activity filters, two sets of charcoal, demisters, and a lot of  
5 other things. Anything except a noble gas, in any detectable  
6 amount, has not gotten out of the facility since, basically,  
7 since shortly following the accident.

8 MS. BARLEY: No particulates?

9 MR. VOLLMER: No particulates, no.

10 MS. BARLEY: Was there anything in suspension in the  
11 water?

12 MR. VOLLMER: Well, there is plenty of things in  
13 suspension in the water, but the water is held in tanks. And the  
14 air in all these buildings is taken in from the outside and up  
15 through the filtration system, one that was there before the  
16 accident and one that was added in back of it after the accident.

17 MS. BARLEY: "The accident" referring to yesterday?

18 MR. VOLLMER: TMI-2's accident. No, no. No.

19 MS. BARLEY: No, the big one?

20 MR. VOLLEY: The big one, yes.

21 And, no, and after that there was a very, very large  
22 installation, which, if those of you who have driven by the  
23 facility have noticed a rather new sheet-metal structure on top  
24 of the concrete building, that big structure there is just  
25 housing and weatherproofing that filtration system that was

20-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 added after the accident. It was flown in from another large  
2 reactor, in the state of Washington, and put there to preclude  
3 any additional releases after the accident.

4 So I would have to say, as much as we can determine,  
5 there just isn't anything available, nor would anything get out  
6 of that. And when I say "anything" I can't -- there is no such  
7 thing as nothing or zero; there is always a few atoms. But we  
8 are talking again about, I don't like to use the term, but  
9 immeasurable amounts, amounts that can't be detected by our  
10 monitors.

11 MS. BARLEY: Okay, thank you.

12 MR. VOLLMER: Thank you, Susan.

13 Yes, sir, in the blue plaid sweater?

14 MR. MORGAN: My name is James Morgan. That is M-o-r-  
15 g-a-n.

16 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

17 MR. MORGAN: You are welcome.

18 I am an engineering student at Hack. And I am going  
19 to assume that this environmental impact study is worth something  
20 and that tonight is worthwhile. If I am wrong, I apologize. But  
21 I do have to believe that.

22 I have some specific suggestions for you. And I hope  
23 you will take them seriously.

24 First let me say that I agree with the League of Women  
25 Voters. To maximize human and mechanical error in the clean-up

22-JO

1 let me respond to your comments, which are very good.

2 You know, the maximizing the human error element is  
3 certainly one which the President's Commission and the recent  
4 investigation report has pointed out is necessary to do and is  
5 something that hasn't been done adequately in the past.

6 The secondary -- oh, and it is something that is the  
7 object of a series of requirements on other operating plants  
8 that are being instituted. So it is something that, it is a  
9 lesson that we learned from this accident and should have perhaps  
10 been recognized long before but wasn't.

11 As far as the secondary malfunctions, that is another  
12 area where many new requirements have been instituted to, in a  
13 sense, treat supporting systems and systems which are, as you  
14 point out, are not necessarily part of the primary system but  
15 which have tie-ins and relationships to them. These, indeed, can  
16 cause problems. And there are many new requirements on those  
17 plants that are operating or under construction that are required  
18 for that.

19 I will let Don handle the other one, because I am not  
20 sure. What would you require?

21 MR. SELLS: The type of release that occurred yester-  
22 day would be considered in the course of developing a statement  
23 in the accident consideration of each of the steps in the decon-  
24 tamination process, an accidental release or a small puff release  
25 that might occur because of some something going wrong in the

23-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 decontamination process itself.

2 The "unavoidable adverse effects" is a section which  
3 we always address as a result of the requirement of NEPA, if we  
4 identify unavoidable adverse effects that may occur in the con-  
5 struction or operation. And in this case, the decontamination,  
6 we must highlight them and point them out.

7 We are in the process of the analysis now. I cannot  
8 say that we will not find any. We have not identified any  
9 specific unavoidable adverse effects that will go into that  
10 section as of today. But again, the type of thing that happened  
11 yesterday would be addressed as an accident consideration in  
12 each step of the decontamination process.

13 MR. MORGAN: Would you be taking into consideration,  
14 at each step of the clean-up procedure, what would happen if --  
15 and then listing a number of possible accidents?

16 MR. SELLS: The answer to that is yes.

17 MR. MORGAN: That is -- okay.

18 VOICE: Why didn't they do that when they built the  
19 thing?

20 MR. SELLS: I think I didn't --

21 VOICE: Why didn't they do that when they built the  
22 thing?

23 MR. SELLS: There was, that was done, in the environ-  
24 mental statements that preceded the construction and operation  
25 of the plant.

24-JO

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

MR. MORGAN: I see.

MR. SELLS: And the safety evaluation more specifically did a lot of what if.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. I have one remaining question. And that is why the environmental -- excuse me, my voice is changing -- why in the environmental impact statement do you have the benefit/cost balance? I don't understand why that is proper to include that in the environmental impact statement. Why should this survey be concerned with the costs of the clean-up procedures?

MR. SELLS: That is a very good comment. And I welcome that comment. In the normal federal action type impact statement which we do on construction operation, there is a balancing of cost and benefit. And in this particular statement we have had many discussions concerning whether or not there is an ability to come to a cost/benefit analysis when you don't know what the final process is going to be. But we certainly can associate estimated costs with the various alternatives of the decontamination process. And that is what we will do.

We will list the alternatives, we will show the environmental impacts of each of the alternatives, and we will identify the costs with each of the alternatives. But, to balance, there must be, you must balance it against something, you must balance it against a specific proposal. And until we know the specific proposal, we can't really balance the alternatives and run the

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345



25-JO

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

cost/benefit analysis.

Where specific requests and proposals have been made, then we can do that. But there's too many things that are not firm, and so we will probably just provide cost summaries. And the title of that section will, no doubt, be changed in the final outline.

MR. MORGAN: How much will that section play a part in deciding which method to use to clean up TMI-2?

MR. VOLLMER: I think I tried to get to that a little bit earlier, when I said that our current regulations do discuss cost/benefit in an operating reactor. They, more specifically, say that -- and these were regulations that were developed as a result of the rule-making process, which included a great deal of public input and a great deal of input from Dr. Goffman and others -- that process turned out to say, if I can encapsulate it, that a operating facility would have to spend an additional thousand dollars in capital equipment if that thousand dollars could reduce the man rem, in other words, the integration of the population times the dose, the man rem for one man rem per year.

So that if we are evaluating a plant and looked out 50 miles and looked at the population and determined that you could reduce, over a year's operation, to that 50-mile population, you could reduce the dose from all sources -- air, water, food, all the pathways -- 25 man rem and it would cost you \$25,000, then we would require the facility to make that investment.

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

26-JO

1 If, however, in order to reduce it one man rem, it  
2 would cost \$50,000, then that was not, that cost/benefit determi-  
3 nation need not require the facility to take the action.

4 In the case of TMI, I think that it is likely that, it  
5 has been in the past and I am sure will be in the future, that  
6 such cost/benefit determinations are not and probably won't be  
7 made, because there are other costs which are being considered  
8 and it is very difficult to consider them conceptually but cer-  
9 tainly the costs that are being considered are the psychological  
10 stress, anxiety, or whatever that result from releases of any  
11 kind.

12 If we could go by our normal regulations, as I indi-  
13 cated before, a great deal of the clean-up process could have  
14 already been accomplished -- given the equipment, I am saying,  
15 we could have gone forward. So I think that in a sense there  
16 were more factors than dollars and cents, many more factors than  
17 dollars and cents, being considered in how to assess the impacts  
18 of releases from this particular decontamination, clean-up  
19 process.

20 And also, as I mentioned before, the Commission has  
21 specifically asked that as part of the comments on this environ-  
22 mental impact statement, that any thoughts people have as to  
23 what criteria we should use in evaluating, the criteria to use,  
24 it would be helpful. In other words, to save one person from  
25 getting one millirem of radiation, should you spend a billion

1 dollars? Maybe the answer would be yes. But again it is the  
2 type of thing that eventually one could, you know, envision  
3 something which would cost us a unattainable amount of money  
4 which may save a very small amount of dose, and so some sort of  
5 a balancing would have to be made as to use the most reasonable  
6 and expeditious but yet safest way to go forth.

7 MR. MORGAN: Then what you are saying, in effect, is  
8 that you can't guarantee the people of this area that Met Ed  
9 will use the safest technique possible.

10 MR. VOLLMER: Well, I don't, that is certainly not our  
11 intent. You know, I, again, I tried to be very open and say,  
12 you know, you can foresee a situation where saving a minute  
13 amount of radiation could cost a billion dollars. Now, if that  
14 type of a judgment got to be made, I certainly don't know how  
15 it would be made, how you could justify it.

16 MR. MORGAN: Who will make the decision on how much  
17 money to spend as opposed to how much we are going to be pro-  
18 tected?

19 MR. VOLLMER: I don't think that, well, I don't know  
20 if a money decision will be made. I suspect that, rather than  
21 that, specific criteria will be set forth under which the clean-  
22 up process will have to be achieved, in other words, that certain  
23 -- the functional requirements of the processes to be used and  
24 the activities which could be released will be defined, hopeful-  
25 ly. Whether that is --

28-JO

1 MR. MORGAN: Did you answer my question? I must have  
2 missed it if -- I am asking what agency will be responsible for  
3 the decision-making.

4 MR. VOLLMER: Oh, okay, I am sorry. The Commission.

5 MR. MORGAN: Okay. That is all. Thank you.

6 (Applause)

7 MS. SESSA: Okay, my name is Anne Sessa, S-e-s-s-a.

8 Now, I have been at several meetings, and my question  
9 is going to be concerned entirely with the report from Met Ed on  
10 the venting of the gas.

11 They took us into the lower Switch Hard building and  
12 they told us how it worked. And we got the very strong impres-  
13 sion that they had the okay and that your okay was just a rubber-  
14 stamp. When I asked several possibilities and probabilities and  
15 asked the man to tell me when I was exaggerating, he said, "You  
16 are not."

17 And I stopped again and I said, "This could happen? Am  
18 I exaggerating?"

19 He said, "You are not." And he just left it.

20 Now, the bottom line to it all and my question to you,  
21 to make this short and sweet, is, I asked him who controlled,  
22 whose payroll was the man who was going to control this venting  
23 on, who controlled when it was vented, and he told me very nicely  
24 and very truthfully, like a good PR man, "Met Ed's." Now, my  
25 question is, gentlemen, how can you even entertain the thought

29-JO

1 of letting Met Ed, in view of what they have done to us here,  
2 control anything that serious to our lives and to our children's  
3 lives? And is it true that your okay is just a rubberstamp some-  
4 where down the road when they calm us down enough to take it?

5 (Applause)

6 MR. VOLLMER: Well, I assume you are talking about the  
7 venting of the containment.

8 MS. SESSA: The venting of the krypton gas that is in  
9 there now.

10 They have been holding meetings. They have a booklet.  
11 Surely you have been apprised of the booklet?

12 MR. VOLLMER: I haven't seen the booklet. I am aware  
13 at the meeting that was held in Lower Switch Hard, although I  
14 wasn't there. But they submitted a report to me on November 13th  
15 of last year, requesting authorization to purge the gas. Shortly  
16 after that, I responded with a letter saying that they did not  
17 have authorization to purge that gas and that we would review  
18 their proposal and the alternatives as well as a number of  
19 options that we ourselves had generated for treatment of the gas,  
20 in preparation of an environmental assessment, which will be made  
21 public in the next couple of months, and the Commission, that is,  
22 the five Commissioners, will ultimately make the decision on  
23 that. It certainly is far from a foregone decision of any kind.  
24 It is far from a cut and dried matter, as far as I am concerned.

25 MS. SESSA: Okay. This is not the impression we are

30-JO

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

being given. And I think --

MR. VOLLMER: Well --

MS. SESSA: -- it is part of our psychological thing --  
to let us stop fighting because you are going to rubberstamp it  
and we will just have to live with it.

Now, if it isn't true, how can you gentlemen, that  
represent Washington and represent, are supposed to represent  
our betterment -- and if you want the nuclear industry to con-  
tinue -- how can you allow this?

He was a wonderful PR man. He was very calm. He was  
very straight. And he told us, "The bottom line is, when we get  
the NRC's okay, you will have to live with it." And that is what  
he told us at that meeting.

Now, how can you gentlemen allow this propaganda to go  
on if it isn't true? And if it is true, why not save us all a  
lot of trouble and say, "Yes, we got the rubberstamp ready," and  
let us prepare for what we want to do about it?

MR. VOLLMER: Well, I think that that is hardly true,  
that there is a rubberstamp involved here. I certainly can't --

MS. SESSA: You know that is a cliché.

MR. VOLLMER: I can't preclude the Metropolitan Edison  
from holding meetings and discussing and tell you whatever they  
wish. That is their prerogative and not mine. But --

MS. SESSA: Can you make the public aware that the  
Metropolitan Edison can go around -- how about a little publicity

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

31-JO

1 on this, so that we don't think, or that the other people don't  
2 think, no matter how hard we fight, we are not going to get it?

3 I took it to Senator Hynes last night. The lady here  
4 is right. He stopped short of calling anyone a liar, as from the  
5 NRC. But he did say you spoke untruth. So that is as close, I  
6 guess, as we are going to get.

7 We are going to fight this. And I can't understand,  
8 in view of what Metropolitan Edison has done to us, how -- and  
9 you are supposed to be protecting us, I think you are our Washing-  
10 ton standard-bearers, and the nuclear industry's -- why you are  
11 letting them go around and why you are letting them create this  
12 impression.

13 And as I say again, since we are talking about psycho-  
14 logical effect, isn't that a war-type propaganda that they are  
15 spreading among our people: don't fight any more, it is useless?

16 MR. VOLLMER: Well, I don't, as I say, I wasn't at the  
17 meeting. I imagine that what they discussed at the meeting was  
18 probably the proposal that they sent us in November. The propa-  
19 ganda aspect, again, I can't comment on, since I wasn't there.

20 MS. SESSA: Okay. He had his physicist there. And  
21 through the whole thing we had good questioners; these people  
22 have become educated, not because maybe they have had the  
23 schooling, but because they have had to be. And there were so  
24 many things that came up, so many things that were wrong, that I  
25 think the people should know about it. They couldn't guarantee

32-JO

1 anything. But the bottom line was, it was the cheap way to do  
2 it and that is what they were going to do. And believe me, the  
3 impression is still there that you are going to somehow stamp  
4 this okay. And that, if it is not, then I think you should be  
5 fighting Met Ed right now, along with these people, for creating  
6 this atmosphere around and getting us so worked up.

7 MR. VOLLMER: Well, that is clearly not the case.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause)

10 MR. MURPHY: Good evening. I would like to thank the  
11 earlier gentleman for the introduction. I am Murphy. I don't  
12 usually subscribe to the law, but based on Met Ed's performance  
13 in the last year I find it very hard not to.

14 My name is Timothy Murphy. I live in Hummelstown,  
15 Pennsylvania. I would like to speak on one specific topic, or,  
16 rather, one general topic regarding the EIS and three specific.

17 In general terms, first of all, I would like to clarify  
18 what the purpose of the EIS is. My impression, from the National  
19 Environmental Policy Act, and also from the Commissioners' state-  
20 ment in the Federal Register last November, was that this whole  
21 procedure was going to take place to involve the public in the  
22 decision-making process. However, I find in the outline through-  
23 out chapter five, subsections 5.1.2, 5.2.2, 5.3.2, 5.4.2, 5.5.2,  
24 and 5.6.2, all refer to, and I quote, "alternative methods con-  
25 sidered and reasons for choice in decontaminating the containment



33-JO

1 building." What I don't understand is, if the choices are made  
2 and defined in the EIS, then just what is its purpose? This  
3 seems to contradict what the Commissioners stated in their  
4 publication in November.

5 I suspect that the document will be nothing more than a  
6 justification statement, rather than a decision-making tool,  
7 which I was always led to believe was its purpose.

8 Can we get some clarification on this?

9 MR. VOLLMER: Dan.

10 MR. MULLER: You are right, we have 5.1.2, "alternative  
11 methods considered and reasons for choice," and so on ad infini-  
12 tum, right.

13 What we are going to do in preparing the statement is  
14 assume various methods of, and this is for, in the case of 5.1.2,  
15 various methods of decontamination of the containment. We have  
16 to do something. And we are going to assume some methods of  
17 decontamination of the containment. There are a variety of  
18 alternatives. There are probably a hundred alternatives of doing  
19 it. We are going to pick what we feel are the two, three, or  
20 four most reasonable ones.

21 We will describe them, give the reasons that they were  
22 chosen, and give the reason that we rejected the rest of them.

23 MR. MURPHY: So that --

24 MR. MULLER: And we are going to do that all the way  
25 through the statement.

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 MR. MURPHY: -- when it says "choices," then, it is a  
2 range of possibilities? It is not --

3 MR. MULLER: That is right.

4 MR. MURPHY: It is not a specific --

5 MR. MULLER: That is right.

6 MR. MURPHY: -- decision made for that particular  
7 aspect of the clean-up?

8 MR. MULLER: That's right.

9 MR. MURPHY: Okay. Thank you.

10 Getting at the more specific items, I would also  
11 question the misnomer of the term "waste disposal" used several  
12 places in the document, since we have, in fact, no known method  
13 of disposal but can only store radioactive waste. To say that  
14 we will dispose of the waste means that we are going to just dump  
15 it somewhere and walk away. I certainly hope this isn't going to  
16 happen. I would like to have that terminology clarified when the  
17 statement is put together.

18 MR. MULLER: I guess when we talk about disposal of  
19 waste we are probably guilty of jargon. "Disposal of waste" is,  
20 really means, how the waste material will ultimately be handled.

21 MR. MURPHY: Yes, right, I realize that.

22 MR. MULLER: No implication at all that we are just  
23 sort of going to, you know, toss it off and forget about it.

24 MR. MURPHY: The point I am getting at, though, is that  
25 we aren't disposing of our waste. We are storing it. We found

1 Hanover. We know we are not disposing of it. And to make that  
2 assumption and write an impact statement on that premise is to  
3 just start off with a fallacy.

4 MR. MULLER: No. You are absolutely right. We -- and  
5 I agree completely with you -- and I say we are guilty of jargon.  
6 And that is, it is really wrong; it is a clever euphemism you  
7 use. And you are right on it, in terms of radioactivity, radio-  
8 active material, that you cannot destroy it, you can't dispose of  
9 it. You can put it somewhere. And that is what we mean by  
10 "disposal of waste."

11 MR. MURPHY: Okay. Thank you. I will expect to see  
12 the change in the EIS.

13 On another topic, yesterday we had an accident at Three  
14 Mile Island. In the realm of radiation monitoring, notification  
15 of state and local officials, and evacuation of the public, we  
16 are sitting here tonight -- on March 29, 1979. Note the date.  
17 Because looking at it quite realistically, we have made that much  
18 progress in those areas. It is as if the original accident  
19 happened yesterday and not a repeat.

20 Met Ed can't be trusted to police itself. Why are they  
21 reading the monitors? Why isn't the NRC, or a private company,  
22 not partly owned by Met Ed, reading the monitors? This is the  
23 way we are going to get honest readings and honest notification.  
24 Nobody, no one still knows what to do in the event of an evacua-  
25 tion. If that had been a major release yesterday, what would we

1 have done? We still don't know, ten months later.

2 (Applause)

3 And my final point is on the benefit/cost ratio. I am  
4 glad to see that you are leaning away from using such an analysis.  
5 I say that because the benefit/cost ratio would always come out  
6 better for the process of clean-up leading to a reopening of  
7 the plant, rather than for the clean-up leading to decommission-  
8 ing. This has to be the case because for the first situation  
9 the costs will always be offset by Met Ed's regained generating  
10 capacity. For the decommissioning alternative, the cost would  
11 only be offset by the health, peace of mind, and lives of the  
12 public, which we happen to feel are priceless. Some people think  
13 that Met Ed, and possibly the NRC also, feel that they are worth-  
14 less. In either case, you can't make the analysis, because you  
15 can't assign an unbiased dollar figure to the health, peace of  
16 mind, and lives of people. There is no way that you can do that  
17 and offset the cost of what we are asking you to do.

18 So I ask you very strongly not to use a benefit/cost  
19 analysis.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause)

22 MR. COLLINS: I would like to comment on your statement  
23 concerning the notification to the state and civil defense,  
24 because that was an issue that was quite -- discussed on the TV  
25 today at quite length. Colonel Henderson had quite a few remarks

1 concerning it. Head of the civil defense in Dolfam (?) County  
2 had quite a few remarks on that. And believe me, I am not taking  
3 sides on it one way.

4 I want to try to explain to you, first of all, why  
5 Met Ed did not notify them: because under their current emergency  
6 procedures, if the plant establishes that it is a site emergency,  
7 then there are off-site notifications made; they are made immedi-  
8 ately to the Bureau of Radiation Protection, in Harrisburg; they  
9 notify PEMA and they notify civil defense.

10 What occurred yesterday, the incident, was a local  
11 emergency. What "local emergency" means, a local evacuation, is  
12 that when in a particular area, inside a building, if a radiation  
13 monitor alarms for some reason, that is the procedure to evacuate  
14 people from the building until you can establish why that monitor  
15 alarmed. You don't, you just don't leave people sitting in the  
16 building when you have a monitor. Even if it malfunctions, the  
17 normal procedure is to evacuate the people, determine why that  
18 monitor alarmed. That was a local alarm that went off, a local  
19 emergency; it was not a site emergency.

20 Now, in the newspaper today, Colonel Henderson criti-  
21 cized, and recognized himself that there were no requirements  
22 that Met Ed notify them, and said that within the sensitivity of  
23 the operations that at least a courtesy call should have been  
24 made.

25 And I discussed this afternoon, if you saw TV tonight,

38-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 you saw Herman Dieckamp, the president of TPU, discussing this  
 2 with -- on TV tonight. And I discussed the subject with him,  
 3 too. And I believe you can see some changes that would be made.  
 4 Even though the requirements set forth in their emergency plan  
 5 do not specify that they must do it, I think you will see some  
 6 changes being made by Met Ed in that regard.

7 MR. MURPHY: I am sorry, I didn't make myself very  
 8 clear in my statement. What I intended to do, when I was  
 9 scribbling down notes here in the meeting and, apparently,  
 10 missed it, was that what we real? need is some strengthened  
 11 form of notification and evacuation plan during the clean-up  
 12 process; because of the admitted high potential for radiation  
 13 releases down there, I think there has to be some system set up  
 14 prior to the occurrence, so we know -- we ought to know when a  
 15 major operation is going to be undertaken down there, when they  
 16 are going to crack open that containment building or when they  
 17 are going to start messing with the core, so that we can be pre-  
 18 pared. I want to have my suitcase packed and ready to go.  
 19 Because that is how much faith I have in this whole operation.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause)

22 MR. COLLINS: Let me assure you that you will be noti-  
 23 fied before any major operation is performed down there at the  
 24 site.

25 Periodically and before Christmas and with the holiday

39-JO

300 7TH STREET S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 season, we were, together with the Division of Environmental  
 2 Resources and the Metropolitan Edison Company and ourselves, con-  
 3 ducting almost meetings every other week in Harrisburg to inform  
 4 the public, Met Ed would inform the public of those operations  
 5 they could expect to occur over the next couple of weeks. Those  
 6 meetings are continuing.

7 We have discussed, between the DER people and ourselves  
 8 and Met Ed, the possibility of moving those meetings to other  
 9 localities -- Lancaster, Middletown, Hummelstown -- over the next  
 10 several months, to keep you people informed of those operations  
 11 you can expect to occur in the next several months.

12 MR. HOSSLER: My name is Don Hossler, H-o-s-s-l-e-r.  
 13 I live here in Middletown.

14 And, Mr. Muller, I sent my comments to you about a week  
 15 ago. So I am just going to speak generally.

16 You guys really have your work cut out for you, because  
 17 I think you can --

18 MR. MULLER: Mr. Hossler, could I, can I interrupt for  
 19 just one second?

20 MR. HOSSLER: Sure.

21 MR. MULLER: I did receive your letter.

22 MR. HOSSLER: Yes.

23 MR. MULLER: And, as a matter of fact, before coming  
 24 here this evening, I tried to get hold of you, and it turns out  
 25 you have an unlisted telephone number.

40-JO

1 MR. HOSSLER: Right.

2 MR. MULLER: And, in fact, I wanted, I was very im-  
3 pressed by the thoughtfulness and the, that with which you pre-  
4 pared your letter, and I wanted to talk to you, because I felt  
5 that you made some, you know, extremely worthwhile points and I  
6 wanted to hear from you.

7 But I couldn't get hold of you because you have an  
8 unlisted telephone number --

9 MR. HOSSLER: Yes.

10 MR. MULLER: -- and I had no way of doing it.

11 MR. HOSSLER: The phone would be off the hook all the  
12 time if I --

13 MR. MULLER: Pardon?

14 MR. HOSSLER: The phone would be off the hook all the  
15 time if I had a listed phone number.

16 MR. MULLER: I see. What do you have, children or  
17 something? Or --

18 MR. HOSSLER: No, I was a school teacher, see.

19 MR. MULLER: I see. Excuse me for interrupting you.

20 MR. HOSSLER: Right. Basically, though, I really feel  
21 that you have your work cut out for you, and the two gentlemen  
22 here on the end, Mr. Muller, and the other gentleman. I think it  
23 is very important. Mr. Vollmer mentioned earlier that sometimes  
24 some of these meetings aren't productive. But, like, when people  
25 like Al Manik and other people get up and tell you how they feel,



41-JO

1 I think in that regard they are very productive, because I think  
2 you need to know how we feel about this.

3           An. just a few thoughts here. First of all, when the  
4 environmental assessment on EPICOR-2 was completed, groups like  
5 SVA, who you have heard of, they went to court. And these are  
6 citizen groups. And money, they are deeply in debt because they  
7 went to court. And the same thing is happening all around here.  
8 And I see as this draft is completed, I see unless you get some  
9 kind of citizens' advisory group or some other type of input in  
10 here, a lot of groups in the area have been working, and working  
11 with congressmen, to get intervenor funding going. You have to  
12 realize that in this area their, the sentiment towards anti  
13 or pro was not too much out of the way, I think, before the  
14 accident, because the people just weren't informed and they went  
15 out and informed themselves. And so the point I want to make  
16 here is that no matter what kind of assessment or environmental  
17 impact statement is made, the public really is unable, in many  
18 instances, to rebut what is done, because there just isn't money  
19 available. And I think it is a very sad state of affairs.

20           The second thing that I would like to point out is that  
21 the psychological stress here cannot be understated. Even though  
22 only a few people are here tonight, you have to realize that some  
23 people aren't aware of the meeting, they missed the meeting, and  
24 a lot of people just aren't that familiar with the formal  
25 processes that go on here. And you cannot understate this issue

42-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 at all, no matter what is being discussed.

2 Also, the cumulative effects, Mrs. Lee or someone h  
3 talked about getting a reading on what has been released since  
4 the accident -- very, very important. And I would hope the  
5 assessment would address itself to this.

6 And then finally, my presentation is very disjointed  
7 because, as I said, I did put something in writing, the second  
8 thing, the final thing here, really, is, I would hope that copies  
9 will be made available in the NRC office here in Middletown as  
10 soon as possible on the draft of the EIS, you know, not like a  
11 week or two later, as soon as it is available, because a lot of  
12 times when you see it in the Federal Register, or wherever it  
13 appears, it takes a while to get it.

14 And the other thing is the environmental assessment on  
15 krypton. I would hope that that would be in there in a timely  
16 fashion and copies readily available.

17 And then, just finally, once again. I can't tell you  
18 enough that I think citizens can have a great impact on this, but  
19 if they don't have the money, you know, a lot of times, I think,  
20 the whole process is sort of useless.

21 MR. VOLLMER: Okay. Thank you. And appreciate your  
22 comments, Don.

23 As far as the, these documents will be made available  
24 promptly at the Middletown office. And I think that your  
25 comments are well taken that the involvement, we need a different

43-JO

1 mechanism than we perhaps have now. And that is why I indicated  
2 before we do, the citizen advisory concept or something like that  
3 is actively under consideration.

4 As far as the publicity for things such as tonight, we  
5 do have things in the newspaper. They get, hopefully, about as  
6 much coverage as we can give them without going door-to-door.  
7 And if there's another mechanism that you would like to suggest  
8 to us in that regard, we would be happy to hear from it, because,  
9 for example, at the forum on the 29th of January, we were criti-  
10 cized by some Maryland groups for not having announcements down  
11 there, but yet we were planning for a meeting down there. So it  
12 is difficult to make sure you contact all the people that do have  
13 the vital interest. And the way we do it is by radio, TV, and  
14 publishing it in the newspapers, and hopefully, from then on it  
15 gets word-of-mouth coverage. But we will keep trying in that --

16 MR. HOSSLER: Well, the DER ones are during the day,  
17 too, and that --

18 MR. VOLLMER: Pardon?

19 MR. HOSSLER: -- makes it very difficult -- the DER  
20 ones are during the day, which makes it very difficult.

21 MR. VOLLMER: Yes, we recognized that.

22 MR. HOSSLER: They have always been --

23 MR. VOLLMER: And that is specifically why we are  
24 having this one tonight.

25 MR. HOSSLER: Yes. That is good.

44-JO

1 MR. VOLLMER: Yes. We realize that. But we --

2 MR. HOSSLER: Maybe I could just clarify something. I  
3 see Joe Suchler (?) from the Press & Journal. Joe, did you get  
4 a press announcement on tonight's meeting last week in time to  
5 get it in?

6 He said it was late. In other words, Middletown has a  
7 weekly, you see, and it comes out every Wednesday. And he said  
8 it was late. So you are having a meeting in Middletown and, you  
9 know, Middletown doesn't know it.

10 MR. MULLER: I just wanted to comment that, you know,  
11 I hear and I understand all of your comments, and I am very --

12 THE REPORTER: Could you speak louder, sir. I can't  
13 hear you.

14 MR. MULLER: I am sorry. I say I hear and I understand  
15 all of your comments and I am very sympathetic with most of them,  
16 in fact, on this whole issue of, you know, the stress in the  
17 community. Frankly, until I have attended the last couple of  
18 meetings, the one, when was it, January 29th, and this one, and  
19 have begun to receive a few letters from people, that I am  
20 becoming very, very aware of this issue.

21 In terms of your getting copies of the environmental  
22 impact statement in a timely manner, what I would suggest is, we  
23 will certainly be glad to mail them directly to anyone that wants  
24 them, if you would just leave your name and address with, I will  
25 leave a pad up here after the meeting and you can, if you can jot

45-JD

1 down your name and address, I would be glad to do that. And, in  
2 fact, Mr. Hossler, yourself, you will get one, because by sending  
3 me a letter you are on my mailing list, so you will certainly  
4 receive one. But I am speaking to the other people here.

5 MR. HOSSLER: I would be happy to meet with you after  
6 the meeting, also.

7 MR. MULLER: Excuse me?

8 MR. HOSSLER: I would be happy to meet with you after  
9 the meeting, if you would like.

10 MR. MULLER: Fine.

11 MR. HOSSLER: Okay?

12 MR. SELLS: For those of you who received an invitation  
13 to this meeting in the mail, you are already on the mailing list  
14 for the draft statement and so you do not have to put your name  
15 on this piece of paper. If you received an invitation in the  
16 mail. There were some four hundred invitations to this meeting  
17 sent out throughout Pennsylvania and Maryland.

18 MR. VOLLMER: What was the mailing list? Officials?  
19 Or --

20 MR. SELLS: It is officials and there were some citi-  
21 zens and also included on it TMI-2 service list.

22 MR. VOLLMER: Okay. Well, we will try to do better in  
23 terms of timeliness for local notification. I think that is the  
24 key. Our mailing lists are rather voluminous, but we don't seem  
25 to get through no matter what we do.

46-JO

1 Yes, please?

2 MS. SNYDER: My name is Irene Snyder and I live in  
3 Middletown.

4 I have attended numerous --

5 THE REPORTER: N-y?

6 MS. SNYDER: Yes, S-n-y-d-e-r.

7 I have attended numerous meetings ever since the acci-  
8 dent. And there is a comment that you made and I hope, Mr.  
9 Vollmer, that I was correct in what I heard. And it disturbs me  
10 and I would like it answered or explained before I go home.

11 When the question about the amount of radiation arose,  
12 you made a statement about the standards are much lower in this  
13 case than in other cases. Would you please explain that?

14 MR. VOLLMER: Okay. What I said, what I tried to get  
15 across was this. The standards that are applied to reactors in  
16 operation are, basically, regulations set up, called Appendix I  
17 to our regulations, anyway, it defines specific criteria in terms  
18 of dose arising from the air pathway, the water pathway, and so  
19 on, that could be received by individuals as part of that plant's  
20 operation. Since the accident, we have used guidelines which  
21 basically I can only describe them as being much more stringent  
22 than that, because many of the activities that we have prohibited  
23 Metropolitan Edison from doing would fall within the guidelines  
24 that are already part of our regulations.

25 And let me give you an example of that. At a normally

47-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 operating power plant, the regulations would allow a certain  
 2 amount of activity to be released which would result in a dose  
 3 to the nearest person to that plant, amounts of krypton could be  
 4 released which would fall within those guidelines buy yet we are  
 5 prohibiting release of that krypton and are looking for alterna-  
 6 tives to process the krypton so that these, this wouldn't be  
 7 released; not so much that we believe that the criteria that we  
 8 have in our regulations are not adequate and not scientifically  
 9 acceptable, but because the accident itself has not only given a  
 10 dose to the population, which, again, has been discussed in great  
 11 detail in a number of reports, but I think more so the heightened  
 12 concern and anxiety over release of any amount of radioactivity.  
 13 And it is a very difficult framework for us to work within,  
 14 because, again, we are accustomed to being able to work within  
 15 a regulatory framework which defines acceptable releases, and as  
 16 many of you pointed out tonight, and in other occasions, you  
 17 don't feel there are any acceptable releases. So it is, that is  
 18 what I was trying to get across: if we were working within the  
 19 framework of our existing regulations, many things could have  
 20 been done and been done within those; but we are, effectively,  
 21 looking much harder at how to prevent releases of radioactivity  
 22 in this particular case.

23 MS. SNYDER: You explained it. But it doesn't reassure  
 24 me, anyway, because who sets the standards?

25 MR. VOLLMER: The standards of Appendix I were set by

48-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554 2345

1 a process called the rule-making process, in which the regula-  
 2 tions were proposed and a very, very lengthy, public hearings  
 3 were held, over a period of, what, two years? -- four-and-a-half  
 4 years, four-and-a-half years, to arrive at that particular regu-  
 5 lation. And okay, it has the effect, in the regulatory sense, it  
 6 sort of has the effect of law on us. These are the requirements,  
 7 these are the rules we live by in doing our job.

8 MS. SNYDER: I understand that part. Were those rules  
 9 established before the Army did its experimentation and before  
 10 those people in Utah suffered the effects of radiation from  
 11 experiments that were going on in their areas? Were those  
 12 standards set before that or since then?

13 That four-and-a-half-year period that you are talking  
 14 about when you established standards of acceptable radioactivity.

15 MR. VOLLMER: I guess the answer to your question would  
 16 be before, since the --

17 MS. SNYDER: Aha.

18 MR. VOLLMER: -- regulations were effective in, have  
 19 been effective for a number of years. And the --

20 MS. SNYDER: Well, that reassures me even less.

21 (Laughter)

22 So I guess I will go home with that worry on my mind.

23 MR. VOLLMER: Well, I would point out that, as I under-  
 24 stand it, the people in the Utah case received very high levels  
 25 of radiation, not very low levels. They were not levels, they



49-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 were much in excess of those cited by our regulations.

2 MS. SNYDER: I realize that. And I realize this is

3 also a fairly new field.

4 MR. VOLLMER: Okay.

5 MS. SNYDER: And that also prompts my --

6 MR. VOLLMER: Yes?

7 MS. SNYDER: -- next, very disturbing thought. Is the

8 nuclear industry using Three Mile Island as a guinea pig because

9 they have not had this experience before? And I think many of

10 us have that feeling, that we are being used as guinea pigs, the

11 plant itself, everything that goes on down there.

12 MR. VOLLMER: I, as a guinea pig for doing what? I --

13 MS. SNYDER: Finding out what happens when there is

14 "an accident" of this type and then the ensuing occurrences since

15 then --

16 MR. VOLLMER: Well --

17 MS. SNYDER: -- because they haven't had to deal with

18 such a thing.

19 MR. VOLLMER: Well, it is certainly a new experience,

20 if that is being characterized as a guinea pig. But the activi-

21 ties that are being conducted there are activities that have a

22 very similar relationship to activities that have been conducted

23 in military applications, in the weapons program and the produc-

24 tion of fuels for the weapons programs where high-level radio-

25 active wastes have been generated. So, in that sense, I don't

50-JO

1 think it is a guinea pig.

2 I think that you may be referring to a program set up  
3 by the Department of Energy and others that are going to try to  
4 determine when the decontamination process is under way what one  
5 can learn from the accident now that it has happened. And since  
6 the accident has happened, I think every effort is being made to  
7 learn from the clean-up process and to try to keep such things  
8 from ever happening again.

9 But I don't think that is really being a guinea pig.  
10 I don't think we are trying anything out at the expense of  
11 releasing radioactivity. I would have to say categorically no  
12 to that.

13 MS. SNYDER: Well, when you mentioned that experiments  
14 had been done and studies, so forth, had been done with the Army,  
15 with its experiment and so forth, apparently, then, the nuclear  
16 industry did not learn its lesson very well if this kind of thing  
17 was permitted to happen.

18 MR. VOLLMER: Well, I, the accident was, I don't think  
19 I would characterize it as being permitted to happen. It has  
20 been not only costly for the citizens in terms of the amenities  
21 of life and the psychological thing, but it has been a very, as  
22 you probably well know, costly for the utilities and the whole  
23 industry, as well as for the, everybody else involved. So I  
24 wouldn't characterize it as being permitted to happen. But I  
25 would say, honestly, that everything is being done to learn from

51-JO

1 what has happened, so that it would be prevented and we can  
2 introduce new requirements for other operating reactors across  
3 the country.

4 But I don't think that is being, as I, I would like to  
5 say, again, I don't know of any activity that has gone on which  
6 was experimental in nature and was using the reactor or a potenti-  
7 al release of radioactivity in a guinea pig way; that is not  
8 correct.

9 MS. SNYDER: Well, perhaps that was the wrong expres-  
10 sion to use. But what I really mean is that I know that other  
11 nuclear plants are in close touch with Met Ed and what goes on  
12 at this plant here, and perhaps because it has gone on so long  
13 and because their credibility is practically zero, that most of  
14 us feel that those who are involved with that industry have a  
15 very callous attitude toward the people in this so-called  
16 provincial area, and I think they were not aware that people  
17 would educate themselves, and there are intelligent people  
18 around, and they would care and now we are all concerned.

19 And when you speak about the psychological aspects, and  
20 someone else had brought it up, as an important part of it, I  
21 think it belongs right at the top priority, because it concerns  
22 human beings.

23 (Applause)

24 MR. VOLLMER: Thank you. Let's get somebody that  
25 hasn't talked. Hugh? Okay.

52-JO

1 MR. CHARLES: Ed Charles, from Mechanicsburg, Pennsyl-  
2 vania. C-h-a-r-l-e-s.

3 Just three quick questions.

4 Paragraph 3.4 and 3.5 bother me a little bit, in that  
5 you have "if necessary the geology." Can any of you tell me what  
6 the geology of the rock type on the island is?

7 MR. SELLS: There was extensive geological survey done.  
8 And the subject of geology, seismology was addressed in the  
9 safety evaluation report. That will be used as the basis of the  
10 information that will be generated for this section.

11 MR. CHARLES: You are speaking of the material from  
12 the Pennsylvania Geologic Survey, Alwright & Sockland (??)?

13 MR. SELLS: I am sure that they were tapped as a source  
14 of information back at the time that the safety evaluation report  
15 was generated.

16 MR. CHARLES: And can you tell me how deep the core  
17 samples were taken and if there are any companies right now who  
18 have been contracted to take some deep core samples on the  
19 island?

20 MR. SELLS: To my knowledge, no one has been contracted  
21 to take deep core samples.

22 MR. CHARLES: Second question: In your ENO statement,  
23 booklet that just came out in January, you had wind directions  
24 and you had various charts on noble gases, et cetera; there was  
25 no mention that I ever saw --

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

53-JO

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

MR. VOLLMER: What is that?

MR. SELLS: ENO.

MR. CHARLES: ENO.

MR. SELLS: ENO.

MR. VOLLMER: Oh.

MR. SELLS: Extraordinary nuclear occurrence.

MR. CHARLES: I couldn't find any information on wind speed or wind velocity. And I can't figure out how you figured out dispersion of gases when only having wind direction.

MR. VOLLMER: Well, you are right, you couldn't with that. But if it is not in the ENO report, it certainly is --

MR. CHARLES: I contacted Carl Abrahams and also Department of Energy in Washington several months ago, back in August. I have not received anything yet.

MR. VOLLMER: Well, I will make a note of it. We do have that down and it is in report form. And that can be provided.

MR. CHARLES: Also in that same report you had a aerial survey which was taken in the mid-60s, I believe. Has there been an aerial survey taken since then to upgrade that information, that is, after the accident or right before the accident?

MR. VOLLMER: I am sorry, I was writing your other one, I didn't get that one.

MR. CHARLES: Aerial survey. Flights over the area. I noticed it because Mechanicsburg Navy base was not plotted. So

54-JO

1 it wasn't a very large area. And the survey was flown, I guess,  
2 by a private contractor -- I didn't bring my copy along -- and it  
3 did register, they had a chart A, B, C, D, E, various levels of  
4 background radiation for the area. Has that been done since the  
5 accident?

6 MR. VOLLMER: I don't think any area surveys were made  
7 after about May 15th? Around May 15th they were terminated by  
8 the Department of Energy. In addition to the private contractor  
9 that Met Ed was using, the Department of Energy had their team  
10 in, of about a hundred people, stationed at the Capitol City  
11 airport; and they were here making aerial surveys, I think, till  
12 about the 15th of May. And that is all available information.

13 MR. CHARLES: Will that be updated in the environmental  
14 impact statement?

15 MR. VOLLMER: I don't think that aerial surveys are  
16 normally taken as part of the environmental impact statement.  
17 So I don't think that there is any particular intent of updating  
18 that.

19 MR. CHARLES: Isn't it good to have the knowledge of  
20 what the background is before you start something, so you have  
21 records --

22 MR. VOLLMER: Well, the background would certainly, is  
23 certainly, is taken by, not necessarily by the aerial surveys,  
24 but by the ground stations.

25 Now, if there is, if a reason can be demonstrated an

55-JC

1 aerial survey would be a good idea, then I think it should be  
2 brought forth.

3 MR. CHARLES: Okay. I also --

4 MR. VOLLMER: If you could, after the meeting, give me  
5 your name, or your address, and I will try to get that informa-  
6 tion for you.

7 MR. CHARLES: Okay. Thank you.

8 One just last question, personal question. Why wasn't  
9 intelligence information downgraded from satellite reconnaissance  
10 back in March last year? We have very detailed information  
11 coming from high-level aircraft. The President, I think, has  
12 indicated we could, in the SALT talks, that we could pick up  
13 small amounts of radiation, et cetera. I have not seen anything  
14 released on satellite, both military or public, information. And  
15 I know they did work off of South Africa recently. Certainly,  
16 there was information gathered. And I have not heard anything  
17 on it.

18 MR. VOLLMER: You are beyond my field. Unless there  
19 is somebody else here that can answer it.

20 MR. CHARLES: It is called remote sensing.

21 MR. VOLLMER: No, I realize, I know what you are talk-  
22 ing about. I don't know how sensitive it is. I know --

23 MR. CHARLES: It is very sensitive. I can vouch for  
24 that.

25 MR. VOLLMER: Well, as you probably recall, it took a

56-JO 1 while to find the Russian satellite that ended up in Canada,  
2 where you had fairly large amounts of radiation. And I am not,  
3 I would imagine that all techniques available were used there.  
4 But, again, I can't really respond to it, because I don't know.  
5 That is something we could look into. I just don't know, Ed.

6 MR. CHARLES: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. VOLLMER: Thank you.

8 How about back there, in the sweater?

9 MS. HEIVLY: Barbara Heivly, H-e-i-v-l-y.

10 It has been publicized when trucks are leaving TMI  
11 carrying low-level radioactive waste. To my knowledge, though  
12 maybe I am incorrect, but I am not aware of the routes that these  
13 trucks are taking. My concerns are, you know, are they taking  
14 the safest route, are they taking the route through the least-  
15 populated areas, and are these trucks also checked for safety.

16 Another concern is, in the EPICOR system, we were told  
17 in the initial stages that we would be kept abreast, not neces-  
18 sarily on a daily basis but certainly on a weekly basis, of what  
19 was going on. And the initial system, or, rather, schedule I  
20 should say, the two months of, hopefully, having this water  
21 processed, of course, for whatever reasons, has not been kept.  
22 I am wondering why are not we informed of the slowdown and/or  
23 difficulty.

24 And last, I have concern about the EIS part in the cork  
25 examination, and I am very, very frightened of "lifting the lid



57-JO

1 off." I know for a fact that this has never been done before;  
2 it is uncharted territory. I don't know what engineers know  
3 about what is going to happen when that lid comes off. But what  
4 are you going to do about the safety of the surrounding residents  
5 when that happens?

6 MR. VOLLMER: Okay. I will answer your last question  
7 and let John Collins answer the first two.

8 As far as the lifting the lid off, that is uncharted  
9 territory when a damaged core is underneath it; that is certainly  
10 true. There have been instances of very extensive core damage  
11 on military reactors and experience has been gained with that.  
12 And I think that the concern, the logical concern, that one would  
13 have in raising the lid would be that, for some reason or  
14 another, a chain reaction is initiated. I think that has been  
15 a concern expressed by a number of people.

16 We will discuss in the EIS what measures will be taken  
17 to preclude any of that from happening. But, very briefly,  
18 there is a concentration of boric acid, which is very poisonous  
19 to a chain reaction, boric acid is part of the makeup of the  
20 primary system now, and when it gets to the time when we remove  
21 the head, it will be also in the system then. The amount of  
22 poison in the system right now is the amount that would keep  
23 the core from having a chain reaction even if no control rods or  
24 any other things were there. So that is an ongoing consideration  
25 and certainly it will be one addressed for removal of the head.

58-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 John, you want to take the transportation?

2 MR. COLLINS: With regards to the transportation of the  
3 waste, the routes have been established since the beginning, or  
4 the time at which most of the shipments began from the island  
5 to Richland, Washington, and to Barnwell, South Carolina. All  
6 of those states are notified, including the state of Pennsylvania,  
7 all of the states en route from here to Richland are notified  
8 prior to the shipment actually either leaving the island or  
9 arriving in that state. That is done both by the Metropolitan  
10 Edison Company and by our own Office of State Programs in the  
11 NRC. And giving them the routes.

12 MS. HEIVLY: My concern is the routes through Middle-  
13 town.

14 MR. COLLINS: The route through Middletown is a  
15 standard routing. ' we are going, 'f the plant is shipping  
16 from here to Richland, I believe, it is on 441 to 230 and then  
17 to 283 and then out west on, I believe it is, Interstate 70,  
18 that? Or alternate, because of weather or other conditions,  
19 there is an alternate route. But it is always known ahead of  
20 time. It is established by the trucking company. And, oh, yes,  
21 the state police are aware of the shipments leaving the state of  
22 Pennsylvania, yes, they are.

23 MS. HEIVLY: I understand they escort them.

24 MR. COLLINS: Yes, they do. And also the Ohio state  
25 police then pick it up on the Ohio border and take it through

1 the state of Ohio, too. Some of the states do that, yes.

2 With regards to truck safety, yes, the truck must meet  
3 the DOT, Department of Transportation, safety requirements. The  
4 truck is inspected, both for radiation levels before leaving the  
5 site and also for safety.

6 MS. HEIVLY: Thank you.

7 MR. COLLINS: With regards to the EPICOR-2, your ques-  
8 tion concerning the processing of the water, yes, it has not, the  
9 amount of water has not been processed that Met Ed originally  
10 predicted. A number of reasons for that. One, of course, is  
11 that all of the water that is in the various tanks in the auxili-  
12 ary building is not of the same chemical constituents, does not  
13 contain the same chemicals; it is not uniform from one tank to  
14 another tank. As a result, in this water that was initially  
15 processed, it achieved much higher removal efficiency than  
16 actually what it was expected to do. Some of the water that has  
17 been recently processed has a much higher suspended solid  
18 content in it, so that it is depleting the resin bed much faster  
19 than what was expected.

20 The program that they have had now is to have the Oak  
21 Ridge National Laboratory take a look at it and adjust the  
22 process to accommodate that suspended, or, as we refer in the  
23 chemical, a chemistry word is "colloidal," to handle that  
24 suspended material. So their program now is, once they have  
25 achieved this information from Oak Ridge, we certainly expect

60-JO

1 that within a period of two to three months the remaining three  
2 hundred and some thousand gallons could be processed in that  
3 building.

4 MS. HEIVLY: So your, am I correct in saying your  
5 removal efficiency isn't as good as it was initially, at this  
6 point of time?

7 MR. COLLINS: At this point in time. But by recircula-  
8 tion of the water through the, through that same filter, you can  
9 achieve that efficiency.

10 MS. HEIVLY: So you are working on that problem?

11 MR. COLLINS: Yes, we are.

12 MS. HEIVLY: Thank you.

13 MR. COLLINS: Don't let me leave you with the idea the  
14 water that is being processed is not as good, as clean a water,  
15 because by recirculating more times through the bed, you can  
16 achieve that same efficiency. But in terms of total processing  
17 the water, you know, the more you have to recirculate, the less  
18 amount of water you are able to decontaminate from other tanks,  
19 because you are recirculating that same water.

20 MR. VOLLMER: Yes. I think your question also was why  
21 weren't the people aware of this. I think that the subject of  
22 the status of EPICOR has been the subject of every one of the  
23 periodic briefings that have been held with the state of Penn-  
24 sylvania, of which there have been five now?

25 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUREAU, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

61-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

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

MR. VOLLMER: So it was started out on a two-week cycle and it is now on like a three-week cycle. But the purpose of that briefing, as Mr. Collins indicated previously, is to say what is, has been done today, what is the progress, and what future operations are contemplated. So maybe these are not held at a very convenient in the time and perhaps if they were held in the evening in Middletown or Lancaster it would be more effective, but we will try to do that.

MS. HEIVLY: Also it is more effective when it is picked up by our local newspaper and media, it is more helpful.

Thank you.

MR. HURST: My name is James Hurst, H-u-r-s-t. And I am president of a community organization in Middletown of concerned citizens, that grew up since the accident at Three Mile Island and in response to the accident.

I have attended any number of these meetings and I have sat and listened and I have participated. And I think time and time and time again the message has been the psychological impact that this accident has had on area residents.

And, Mr. Vollmer, I heard you say that by you people coming here and listening to us that you carry this information back to Washington. I would like to think that that is true, but, unfortunately, our organization has petitioned the NRC to intervene in the hearings, raising the psychological issue, and we are being kept dangling on a string, so I am not sure if the

62-JO

1 information is, in fact, getting back to Washington.

2 That is one of my concerns. And I know that being a  
3 lifelong resident of Middletown and having many friends here,  
4 and in my position as president of this organization, I get  
5 innumerable daily phone calls from people who continue to be  
6 very concerned about the situation at the island. And I heard  
7 three things mentioned this evening that I think would be  
8 extremely important to be included as part of your environmental  
9 impact statement.

10 The one thing is that there should be a citizens  
11 advisory panel. I think it should be, that you should make a  
12 real, deliberate attempt to contact some of the leaders of these  
13 local organizations, who have been active, who have tried to  
14 educate themselves, and who have a tie with the community, know  
15 what the people's concerns are, and deal with them on a day-to-  
16 day basis.

17 I also think that that advisory panel should have  
18 funding provided so that they can solicit input from qualified,  
19 independent experts to help evaluate these assessments that you  
20 people are doing, so that we feel that we are getting the input  
21 and we are able to ask the questions and get the type of informa-  
22 tion that we feel good about.

23 That is the one thing. The second thing is, and Jane  
24 Lee spoke of it earlier, and I think it is an excellent idea, is  
25 the idea to have local citizens trained to do radiation

63-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

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

monitoring. I know that may be a total escape from all previous procedures of the NRC. But I think judging the positive effect that that would have on the psychological impact of this accident on area residents, I think it would be invaluable.

I know from our organization here in town several of us have taken a course with the state and are currently awaiting to take a further, advanced course for radiation monitoring. And I am sure we could get people from the area who would participate in this and provide a very valuable service to all the people of this area.

Another thing that concerns me, and I know it is a concern of area residents, I have read a comment by Thomas Gerusky, from the Department of Environmental Resources, Bureau of Radiological Protection, and I have also heard comments at any number of these meetings, that the future holds the very good possibility of releases of more contamination into the atmosphere. And I think if we are truthful with one another, that it holds some very real, a very real probability that we may have to evacuate again. I think that you have to do more to get this evacuation plan in order.

I have talked with people who are members of local fire companies who are supposedly going to be helping on a volunteer basis with this. To the best of my knowledge, they have not had sufficient training, they don't have the proper equipment, and we are not in any better shape now than we were

64-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 on March the 28th.

2 And I think sitting here on top of a potential daily  
3 situation that could occur, we might have to evacuate, I think  
4 that that would have a tremendous positive impact on the resi-  
5 dents of this area, if you could do more in that respect.

6 One more comment that is not really related to that,  
7 but it is a concern of mine; it is a question. I noticed in  
8 the excerpt from the Federal Register which you had laying back  
9 here, I picked up when I came in, it says, "However, we recognize  
10 that there may be emergency situations not now foreseen which  
11 should they occur would require rapid action." I think some of  
12 those things, krypton, the possibility of krypton venting being  
13 one, another possibility being problems with the EPICOR system  
14 where the continued accumulation of water might cause a need to  
15 dispose of water somehow, whether it be dumping it into the  
16 river or transporting it away or whatever it would be -- is it  
17 possible that you could deal with those very good possibilities  
18 of things that might happen, like with the krypton, and deal  
19 with them separately from this and get those things out and  
20 study the alternatives and kind of give them a priority, and not  
21 lose them in this so that those situations come up and have to  
22 be dealt with before the complete statement is done?

23 MR. VOLLMER: We are doing just that. And in the case  
24 of the krypton, we are doing just that, in the case of looking  
25 at the alternatives for water and also for, as soon as we receive



65-JO

1 additional information, we will be doing that for the processing  
2 of the reactor building water. These would then become part of  
3 this statement. But if you will note in here, the Commission  
4 gave a couple of examples of things that we would need to go  
5 forward with separate, intensive consideration on. One was the  
6 krypton issue and one was the reactor building water. So  
7 whether or not any decision will be made on those issues before  
8 the environmental impact statement comes out is yet to be seen.  
9 But we will certainly try to look ahead to any potential problems  
10 with these, you know, the gaseous and the water activity, and be  
11 ready for anything or foresee any -- we don't foresee now any  
12 emergency conditions that would require prompt action by us or  
13 by Metropolitan Edison, but we would try to, if we saw anything,  
14 foresaw anything like that, we would try to take actions to miti-  
15 gate them. But we are, indeed, doing that. We are, indeed,  
16 looking at those individual things right now.

17 MR. HURST: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. VOLLMER: I might mention that your first comment  
19 was -- and I, certainly your three points are very well taken and  
20 are very constructive and I appreciate them -- your first comment,  
21 on the psychological issue, I think the hearing board, which is  
22 charged with the responsibility of making a recommendation to the  
23 Commission on the psychological issue, spent at least three days  
24 in the area, and many of you people, I know, gave you your views  
25 on the psychological issues, and I think, I have a hard time

66-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 thinking that they aren't very impressed and know very well what  
2 the thoughts of the community are, because I attended one of the  
3 meetings, in Hershey, and I think one of the people that partici-  
4 pated in tonight's meeting was there at that one, the one with  
5 the cats and the dogs; but I think they really had more opportun-  
6 ity than anybody, including myself and John, to hear a concen-  
7 trated dialogue with the community on the psychological issue.

8 I am not sure when they are going to make their  
9 recommendation to the Commission. But I am sure that they really  
10 do understand what the feelings are.

11 MR. HURST: Yes. Well, those meetings occurred on  
12 November 15th, 16th, and 17th.

13 MR. VOLLMER: Right, yes.

14 MR. HURST: And we are now at February the 12th. And  
15 all of the other intervenors have either been, their contentions  
16 have been ruled on and either accepted or rejected. We have  
17 raised the lone contention. And here we sit kind of waiting.  
18 We have contacted some experts who are willing to help us. And,  
19 you know, I don't understand what the holdup is.

20 MR. VOLLMER: Well, I can't answer for that. The board  
21 is, are independent of us, in a sense; they report to the Commis-  
22 sion. And I don't really know the reason for the delay. But I  
23 guess if you, you would have to deal with the, either the  
24 attorneys or the board itself and ask the reasons. I really  
25 don't know.

67-JO

1 MR. HURST: Well, that, I think, I know you have been  
2 to a number of these meetings, and you said earlier this evening  
3 that the message gets back to Washington. And I think you would  
4 admit that if there is one message you have gotten out of the  
5 meetings you have attended, it is the psychological effect of  
6 this accident on the people.

7 MR. VOLLMER: That is right.

8 MR. HURST: And if that message hasn't got back there  
9 by now, what hope do we have that the other things that were said  
10 here this evening are going to get back?

11 MR. VOLLMER: Well, I think I said it did. And I think  
12 the fact that we are not going blindly, if you will, applying  
13 our regulations, which we feel are adequate for other reactors  
14 and other operations in terms of environmental releases, and  
15 applying those to this situation, attests to the fact that the  
16 psychological issue is, indeed, one that has impressed the  
17 decision-making process.

18 MR. HURST: Well, I just urge you to do whatever you  
19 can to expedite that decision.

20 MR. VOLLMER: Thank you. I appreciate it.

21 (Applause)

22 MS. LIGHT: My name is Carrie Light, L-i-g-h-t. And I  
23 have lived here in Middletown for 36 years. I even own my burial  
24 plot in Middletown, and for the first time I think I am going to  
25 use it.

68-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

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

I am glad you mentioned the lady with the dogs and the cats, because I have never talked about having any animals and I have spoken before, but I also have them. And within the last months I have now got two cats with leukemia, a rabbit that I have had a malignant tumor cut off of, and a dog with something growing on its back and, in all honesty, I haven't had the guts to take him to the vet yet.

So I don't know if that has any relevance at all. All I know is, I live two-and-a-half miles away and my mother tasted the stuff on Friday morning. So we feel like we were pretty well dosed.

Now, that, that is irrelevant.

I really wanted to speak to the same issue that Mr. Hurst spoke to. I want to speak to it because, in fact, I work in mental health. Now, I don't work in mental health here in Middletown. I work in mental health at a little bit more distance from here. And it would be a lie if I said that I thought my clients were coming in more disturbed than they used to, because they are not, they are just coming in disturbed like clients always come in. There may be more of them than there were, but I wouldn't even want to make any statements about that.

What concerns me is, I am beginning to see my friends and my neighbors who live here in town looking more and more like my clients. That distresses me.

Now, I am seeing among people I know, just local people,

1 my neighbors, the same kinds of symptoms I am seeing in people I  
2 am treating, only we accept it as normal. We have come to a  
3 place, living here, where we have accepted high anxiety, stress,  
4 fear, and inability to sleep, restlessness, the desire to escape,  
5 a feeling of being trapped, we have begun to accept that as nor-  
6 mal. And that is not normal. And human beings really don't  
7 usually live under those circumstances.

8 I am really very concerned about the long-range impli-  
9 cations of that for people who, in fact, are stuck here. I don't  
10 know, I have heard the press really, really damned for all of the  
11 "bombardment of information" that they have given the public, and  
12 in some ways -- I might be wrong about this, but for me I am  
13 right -- the press has been my saving grace, because even if I  
14 didn't choose to believe it all, I certainly had enough different  
15 points of view to look at.

16 It is very hard for me to look at the press they have  
17 impacted negatively upon the emotional atmosphere.

18 The things that have incredible negative impacts on the  
19 total emotional set of this community are things that you can't  
20 change without making some drastic change in terms of the plant.  
21 You almost can't enter Middletown without being confronted by  
22 Three Mile Island. And I don't know, well, I don't know if you  
23 have noticed that or not, but you can't come up 441, you can't  
24 come in 283, you always have to see that thing. I don't know how  
25 many of you have ever had the experience of someone pointing

70-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 something loaded at you, like a loaded gun or something. Do you  
 2 know that feeling that you have? Like it is not, it doesn't feel  
 3 real good. Well, that is a lethal weapon. And for those of us  
 4 who have been living here with that plant, when we are confronted  
 5 by that, that is very much the same. It is like having somebody  
 6 point something loaded at you. And it is always right in front  
 7 of you. You can't get home without dealing with that.

8 That is one thing. So that just the physical structure  
 9 itself has a major impact upon people who live here.

10 That helicopter, I haven't heard anybody talk about  
 11 the, that helicopter would drive people crazy. You, you, all we,  
 12 I have had half-grown children come up to me when I came home  
 13 from work to tell me, "Something's happening down the road,  
 14 because the helicopter is out." The helicopter that comes out,  
 15 apparently, turns right someplace close to where 441 comes into  
 16 Middletown; it seems to turn over that area. And local people  
 17 will make reference to the activity of the helicopter.

18 Other things that also are probably totally irrelevant  
 19 to Three Mile Island now have a potentially anxiety-producing  
 20 effect. A noise in the night, you know, where once you might  
 21 assume somebody backed into your car, now you assume that some-  
 22 thing has happened at the plant. So that there's all kinds of  
 23 environmental impacts that are directly related to the plant  
 24 over which nobody has much control; they are there, they occur,  
 25 and people are affected by them, and they really can't be

71-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 quieted or changed.

2 So I just think that we need to be more conscious of  
 3 that, because people are really, are being impacted on a daily  
 4 basis by things that they are beginning to believe they cannot  
 5 in any way change. That induces hopelessness. Hopelessness  
 6 induces depression. And if we don't get cancer from radiation,  
 7 then the effect of depression will probably take its toll.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause)

10 MR. MINNICH: My name is Mickey Minnich, M-i-n-n-i-c-h.  
 11 And I am with the Newbury Township Steering Committee for Three  
 12 Mile Island.

13 And I would just like to allude to any item here I have  
 14 just on page 10. Like 11.4: "Off-site exposure and health  
 15 effects," to probably be expanded, and, hopefully, we can place  
 16 something in writing to the NRC which will try to validate and  
 17 make our points clear. That would include the health effects  
 18 both mental and physical.

19 And I think Mrs. Light or Miss Light expressed those  
 20 fears well. And I really don't think a lot of people understand  
 21 them. And even tonight, certain ideas crystallized in my mind  
 22 even as Ms. Light was testifying, and maybe I will try to commun-  
 23 icate this in writing to you and to other people so that they can  
 24 understand it.

25 But we had a visiting person, who was photographing

72-JO 1 certain things about Three Mile Island for an article, and she  
2 escaped from Budapest in '56, and after talking to me and a lot  
3 of people she said, "I can understand your fears," she said,  
4 "because that is the same type of fear we had under a totalitari-  
5 an state." She said, "It is very similar." And hopefully, you  
6 can understand that. Maybe you can't. But maybe we can express  
7 it where you can.

8 The helicopters are very significant. Just today, as  
9 I was dealing at my business with a gentleman, I explained to  
10 him my fear of the helicopter, because it goes over my house and  
11 has been out there today and many times. He was a helicopter  
12 pilot in Vietnam. He said, "You know, Mick," he said, "I can  
13 understand what you are saying." He said, "That is the same  
14 type of stress and psychological fear that I had not knowing  
15 when I had to go out on flight or had to go on reconnaissance."  
16 He said, "I can understand that."

17 Here I have somebody from Budapest under a totalitarian  
18 state tell me about stress, I have a Vietnam veteran tell me  
19 about stress, then I hear Ms. Light so eloquently put this --  
20 it makes a lot of sense to me. And, hopefully, this is why, if  
21 we can put this in writing to your commission, that in this  
22 environmental assessment the off-site exposure and health effects  
23 mental and psychological, which seems, if you are not dead or  
24 lose an arm or an eye, it is hard to validate or hard to prove.

25 So I just wanted to make that point to you.



73-JO

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1           And one thing, the whole reason I got involved in this  
 2 was over my two sons' three days being exposed and I didn't have  
 3 an opportunity to do anything about it. So it has happened again  
 4 yesterday. And one thing our little committee is trying to do  
 5 desperately and I would like to recommend is item 13, and maybe  
 6 it is not part of this, but we have people intervening and we  
 7 are going to present this at a, in fact, it has been presented,  
 8 something to this effect, that evacuation plans for the popula-  
 9 tion surrounding the plant that had been distributed to the  
 10 population and that these plans had been rehearsed and practiced,  
 11 with all sirens and indicators of what is going on. Those sirens  
 12 and indicators would indicate is it a local problem. Because if  
 13 it is a local problem I know that it is local in the plant and if  
 14 I were to take my son and do whatever I had to protect him from  
 15 krypton gas I can do that, that is my right.

16           I get sick and tired of the excuses. We had them March  
 17 28th. We had a problem yesterday. And we always find a way to  
 18 justify why we weren't informed. And with these sirens, it could  
 19 be local and off-site or a possible evacuation, but I think we  
 20 have to go through a practice rehearsal, say, this Saturday, the  
 21 whole population within 15 miles, so you don't get nervous,  
 22 because at 12 o'clock noon this is what you will hear if we have  
 23 a local problem at Three Mile Island.

24           You can do what you want to, but we are letting you  
 25 know this is a local problem. Okay, this is the siren you will

74-JO

1 hear if it is an on-site where we are evacuating people.  
2 Because two nights in a row, last night and the night before,  
3 we have had fires in Clyde, in Yokumtown, and at eleven-thirty  
4 those sirens go -- another element of stress which you don't even  
5 consider. We are thinking, well, what should we do? Should we  
6 get ready to evacuate? Should we listen to the radio?

7 I think unless we practice this, I think we are going  
8 to be in terrible trouble. So, hopefully, we can, we have sub-  
9 mitted this in writing and have spent a lot of time, it is beyond  
10 me as to why, even at this moment, we don't have evacuation  
11 plans. If I would do this in education, I would be fired by  
12 every parent of the students that I am responsible for.

13 So, hopefully, those points will be considered. I  
14 think they are serious points. I think they are points that  
15 everybody is avoiding. And I think we should not do any of this,  
16 because the most important thing in this environment is people  
17 and so, no matter what you do, let's make sure we can take care  
18 of the people.

19 MR. VOLLMER: Fine. Thank you.

20 (Applause)

21 I would like to ask you a question, or anybody else  
22 that would care to respond. Some of the comments that we have  
23 received in the past have dealt with the "no release" or the  
24 "don't do anything," basically, "in case the facility" and  
25 "don't clean it up, just do nothing." How do you feel that, what

75-JO

1 should be the approach? Should the approach be to, I would  
2 assume psychologically the best approach would be to try to get  
3 the place cleaned up and not release anything, to whatever, do  
4 everything possible to pursue that course of action -- do you  
5 agree that that would be the most productive and the best psycho-  
6 logically?

7 MR. MINNICH: Well, I have my viewpoints on it. And  
8 you can do one of two things in my situation. You can be like  
9 Mr. and Mrs. Bill Peffer (?) who are now in Sweden, who moved,  
10 renting their home out at great financial loss, because there  
11 they are going to have a referendum whether they can vote for  
12 nuclear power or not. That is one way to approach it. I know  
13 that certain of your equipment, I am not an expert, as in an area  
14 where you can't service it to keep so many things under atmo-  
15 spheres of pressure, so the big argument is, do we vent krypton  
16 gas or do we wait for an uncontrolled release? I don't have an  
17 answer for that. And I would find some way, regardless of the  
18 cost of money, because that is the bottom line, and if you would  
19 give me unlimited resources I could solve your problem, I think,  
20 by bringing in the proper people that you do, but I think money  
21 might be the bottom line on this, so I don't know all of the  
22 factors in the decision-making process but what I do know is, no  
23 matter what you do, give me a chance to make some decisions on my  
24 own for my children and then let me know the risks, because if  
25 the risks are so great, then, rather than sit here and sit in the

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 basement, where I won't get that much protection, or cover my  
2 mouth because I know krypton, that is the entry into the body,  
3 then I will move. And the way that I would solve this problem  
4 is, fight this battle from a greater distance, because of my  
5 responsibility to my children.

6 But I think the big thing that, and I am glad you, that  
7 is the first time somebody has asked me an intelligent question  
8 where I can give an answer, is just to let me know as we go  
9 along, so I can make the proper decisions on what, you know, you  
10 might decide.

11 MR. VOLLMER: Good. Thank you. We will try to do  
12 that.

13 (Applause)

14 MR. MINNICH: What about -- I would like to ask you a  
15 question, though -- what if there is a release tomorrow, due to  
16 an on-site or local problem at Three Mile Island? Am I going to  
17 be notified? When I say myself, representing the public. And if  
18 I am, how will I be notified? Because I have been through this  
19 twice and I don't want to go through it again.

20 MR. VOLLMER: I think, as far as I know, the mechanism  
21 would be the notification to the state and the state emergency  
22 management, or the state emergency program office, which is --

23 MR. MINNICH: See, this is a grey area that really  
24 confuses me.

25 MR. VOLLMER: Yes. Okay. I think that is obviously a

77-JO

1 valid comment because it has come up so many times. There is  
2 development of a more comprehensive plan which the state and the  
3 NRC and the utility are working on, which would include notifica-  
4 tion of, a better notification and a more prompt notification of  
5 all officials, in other words, local officials, who really have  
6 to conduct the evacuation when you get down to the bottom line,  
7 anyway; it can't be the licensee, it can't be us, and it can't  
8 be the state itself.

9 I guess what really is the problem that we are groping  
10 with here, is at what level, or when, when, what are the criteria  
11 by which the notification occur. And as far as I know, unless  
12 John would like to comment on it, the notification are very  
13 definitive in terms of the emergency plan that exists on the  
14 site, and it was approved by the NRC and the state. I personally  
15 really don't know what the details of that are.

16 MR. COLLINS: Well --

17 MR. VOLLMER: Go ahead, John.

18 MR. COLLINS: I believe, in your particular case, if  
19 a site emergency were declared, then I believe you are in York  
20 County, aren't you, so you would be notified by the York County  
21 civil defense. That is your mechanism for receiving word, and  
22 also additionally from the news media; but the civil defense for  
23 York would be responsible for notification, for Newbury, Golds-  
24 boro, the whole area over there, on a site evacuation.

25 On the local evacuation such as we had at the plant,

76-JO

- 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

END  
TAPE 3

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

where one building, no, you are not notified of that. At the present time that is, no, that is not in the emergency plan, no.

NRC  
Middletown  
2-12-80

Pritchett/  
Irell

Tapes 4 & 5  
page 1

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTING BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 One of the towns, I believe in Montana, where the board  
2 council had voted to not allow your waste to go through the  
3 town. They had a couple of accidents. Is this correct?

4 MR. COLLINS: It was the town of Missoula, Montana,  
5 and the Burl council did pass an ordinance restricting  
6 shipments containing radioactivity above a certain limit, that  
7 it must be circulated or must go around the city on I-80 instead  
8 of through the city on I-90, I-94. That is correct, but it was  
9 not because of the accidents. That was because of the concerns  
10 of the public, the citizens in Missoula, Montana.

11 MR. MANIK: The paper didn't read that way.

12 MR. COLLINS: I have a copy of the ordinance that was  
13 passed, and our state people have been in contact with them.

14 MR. MANIK: Well, it may be in their paper, I will  
15 back up on that one.

16 My other concern is this and I will make it brief.  
17 You come here for an impact study. That is fine. Now you people  
18 on the NRC, your office is in Washington. We sit here, we have  
19 an accident. Fortunately, we get out very good. We did  
20 wonderful. We saved as many people's lives as we possibly could.

21 However, when it comes to the real impact, the farmer  
22 has to make a living. He raises, besides vegetables he has got  
23 cattle and chickens.

24 Now that is his bread and butter, that is his money.  
25 If you were a farmer you would feel the same way.

2  
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

Now what is this poor farmer going to do, providing possibly he has got a wagon, horse and wagon, like some of the farmers do, or he has got a small compact car? How is he going to get his cattle, his chickens, his pigs, his horse in that little wagon, in that little compact car, because this is his bread and butter.

Now if you want the impact statement, answer me and tell me how you would do it.

MR. VOLLMER: Well, Mr. Manik, I would trust that this decontamination and cleanup process can be accomplished without releases that would cause the cattle to flee or the people to flee. I hope that is the case, and I think we will do everything possible to ensure that that is the case.

MR. MANIK: Well, let me answer you there. If I had your trust, I wouldn't be here tonight.

MR. VOLLMER: Anybody else?

Well, I want to thank you. I think that the many comments that we had tonight were very productive and I appreciate the dialogue. If there is anybody that has additional questions, we will be available after the meeting.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 10:30 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

i  
Tapes 4 & 5  
end  
meeting  
Burrell