

*Project Folder*

PAGE \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
TIME \_\_\_\_\_  
BY \_\_\_\_\_  
REMARKS \_\_\_\_\_

PROPOSED DAVIS-BESSE POWER STATION

Following is the text of comments and questions presented by John E. Cook in behalf of the Sand Beach Association at the Atomic Energy Commission hearings in Port Clinton, Ohio, January 25, 1971:

*Copy to ...  
L. ...  
100/50-34  
L. ...*

I am speaking in behalf of the Sand Beach Association which was organized more than fifty years ago. The Association is Incorporated and Sand Beach became a political sub-division in 1948, with creation of the Sand Beach Conservancy District.

Sand Beach property extends along the shore of Lake Erie for a distance exceeding 7,000 ft. and lies generally north of the northern Power Station boundary. The eastern-most portion of land, described as lot 330, adjoins the Power Station property, while the northwestern, and most distant portion lies slightly under 4,000 ft. northwest, from the northwest corner of the power station boundary. Property in plots one and two of Sand Beach are owned by 146 individuals. There are 27 year-round homes and 78 seasonal homes and cottages. The winter population is currently 72 people while the summer population can rise to over a thousand on busy weekends. An additional 17, mostly seasonal and weekend dwellings, are situated in lot 330 adjoining the Power Station property and account for 70 more summer and occasional weekend residents.

The principal use of Sand Beach is recreational and the beach itself, is one of the remaining few good swimming beaches at this end of the lake. Outdoor activities range from fishing, boating, swimming, sailing and shore activities in the summer to ice skating, ice boating and snowmobiling in winter. It has been a place where our children could grow up and build a tree house or dig a cave, opportunities largely denied to them in the larger cities today- and, to learn a little bit about the beautiful world we live in. I am certain that in this setting, you will recognize the advent of a nuclear reactor at our doorstep, has been unsettling.

We had recognized the growing need for additional sources of electrical power and having been assured by Edison Company representatives that adequate cooling towers would be built and no adverse effects or hazards would result from the proposed plant or its operation, we had assumed a posture of reluctant submission.

Two weeks ago we received a report from the previous hearing held in this auditorium, and received a copy of Appendix A, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Environmental Report dated August 3, 1970 - I hope all of you will have an opportunity to read this document - especially those of you who have technical or scientific backgrounds.

I. The first question concerns the Environmental Report -

- a) To what degree are predictions for behavior of the heated water discharge plume, with respect to currents, dilution and diffusivity, based on the report entitled, "Currents and Dilution" on page C-15?

Prior to inclusion of a cooling tower in the Power Station plan, explanation of the discharge plume behavior in the lake was hypothetical and totally unrealistic.

8003060931  
G

POOR  
ORIGINAL<sup>2.</sup>

I. a) continued

Many observations from the air, of streams of various sizes entering Lake Erie show clearly how an entire discharge plume can be held against a shore under high wind and wave conditions. The sentence on page C-24, for example, refers to "that possibly unlikely case wherein a northwest wind was to hold the plant plume tightly against the shore from Locust Point to well beyond the Camp Perry water intake." - appears very likely to us under normal spring to fall weather conditions which apparently, were not taken into account in the study.

We question the validity of the conclusions drawn from the brief six month meteorological study as being unrealistic and incomplete.

- b) The report also ignores late winter and early spring gales which come from the sector between North, Northwest and East, Northeast, and drive seas completely over the beach dike and across Division Street.

At locations where the marsh is within 50 or so feet from Division Street the seas frequently wash directly from the lake into the marsh. This is not an infrequent event and every year many homes are severely damaged by these storms. High water mark evidence can be found on Power Station property also, where seas wash into the marsh.

We can assure you that effluent discharged into the lake in front of the Power Station site during one of these gales will end up saturating nearly every square foot of Sand Beach property from the normal waters edge across Division Street for a width of 150 feet or more.

This is the actual sand and soil we live on - it is our front yards and back yards, and it contains our wells. Residue from the discharged effluent will surround us and collect in the marshes behind. If it is harmful, we will be harmed. We ask for an investigation and evaluation of the effect this condition would have on the health and well being of the inhabitants of Sand Beach and surrounding areas.

- II. We can attest to many instances of high offshore winds causing a five to six foot water level drop which permitted us to walk on essentially dry land several hundred yards out into the lake from the normal shoreline. At times of lesser winds, a series of sand bars are exposed creating shallow channels of water running roughly parallel to the shoreline. Since the report makes no mention of conditions approaching these, we would like to know the following:

- a) What is the nature and configuration of the discharge outlet and where is it to be located and what is its volume, velocity and temperature?

# POOR ORIGINAL

- II.
- b) Would it be possible under high offshore wind conditions previously described for radioactive discharge effluent to concentrate in the shallow channels between the sand bars and contaminate wells located along the beach?
  - c) At normal or high water levels will the turbulence from the discharge flowing into a rough sea create a hazard for small craft attempting to cross the juncture?
  - d) The northern Power Station boundary runs through a large open water area of marsh land which is contiguous with Sand Beach property. This means at present, the 2400 feet exclusion zone is not enclosed by a barrier of any kind.

DIKE IS IN THE PLAN  
IT EFFECT WILL THERE  
ON STAGNATION OF  
THE MARSH?

- 1) Is there a plan to construct a dike at this boundary?
- 2) Is this open water connection between Sand Beach property and a point 1000 feet from the reactor within the intended meaning of "exclusion zone"?
- 3) Does the open water connection pose a hazard to the Sand Beach residents?

III. If the proposed plant is completed and put into operation at the intended level of power output could a required exclusion zone imposed by the A.E.C. or other body result in:

- a) Vacating or expropriation of property?
- b) Restrictions to present activities?
- c) Exposure to health hazards?

Mr. J. K. Davis of Toledo Edison has assured us that no additional land is required for the power station proper beyond that already acquired.

- IV. Almost every winter we are snowbound by very heavy (6 to 8 ft.) drifts for periods ranging from a few hours to several days. In the event of an accident at the plant requiring evacuation of Sand Beach, how would you propose this could be accomplished under these conditions and whose responsibility is this?
- V. Have the safeguards designed for the Davis-Besse plant been used and proven in actual operation of a power plant? We understand the failure of a supposedly proven safeguard to dispose heat was responsible for an accident at the Enrico Fermi Plant.
- VI. Has the general plant site and surrounding area been monitored for normal radioactivity and background count? Is this information available?
- VII. At certain times of year Lake Erie is choked with blue-green algae bloom. Isn't it true that additional heat promotes algae growth? How can you support statements which claim "there is no evidence the discharge would have caused ill effects on Lake Erie ecology"?

VIII. A great deal has been said regarding the wild life refuge which will be created with establishment of the Power Station. Isn't it true that the actual area will be reduced? Is it not also true that the present 2400 foot exclusion zone from the reactor will produce the same radiation hazard to wild life that it would to humans? In time won't the marsh land bottoms become radioactive and contaminate vegetation and marine organisms upon which wild life feeds?

IX. Would residents of Sand Beach and others be permitted free passage to walk along the shore between Sand Beach and the mouth of the Kousaiko River as we have been able to do for years?

Would it be physically possible to do so?

In conclusion, we are aware of the projected requirements for electrical power.

We recognize that no fuel known today appears as feasible and providing as nuclear fuel to fill the growing need. We are not against nuclear power per se and we are not mounting battle against Toledo Edison and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Companies. We support your efforts to meet the challenge of your industry.

We do however believe that many critical questions raised here and by others have not been satisfactorily answered.

We sincerely believe it is in the best interests of all of us to resolve these and other unanswered questions before construction of this facility is completed.

To the slogan "WE LIVE HERE TOO" we must add, "WE LIVE THERE NOW!" and I trust we shall all be able to live together in peace and safety.

Thank you,

John E. Cook, Vice President  
Sand Beach Association

POOR  
ORIGINAL

John E. Cook  
2239 Densmore Road  
Toledo, Ohio 43606



Mr. Harold L. Price  
Director of Regulations  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20545