

MEMO ROUTE SLIP Form AEC-93 (Rev. May 14, 1947) AECM 02-u		See me about this. Note and return:	For concurren For signature.	For action. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For information.
5 4 3 2	TO (Name and unit) H. L. Prigg E. K. Beck M. M. Mann S. H. Hanauer (later)	INITIALS	REMARKS	50-346 2-8-71
1 6	TO (Name and unit) C. L. Henderson H. Shapar	INITIALS	REMARKS	
	TO (Name and unit) D/K	INITIALS	REMARKS	Rec'd Off. Dir. of Reg. Date 2/17/71 Time 4:00
	FROM (Name and unit) P. A. Morris	REMARKS		
PHONE NO.	DATE 2/17			

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

GPO : 1968 O-294-619

POOR ORIGINAL

8003060 974

T

Statement by Irwin I. Oster to be presented to the
U.S. Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
on February 8, 1971

For the past two weeks I have been attempting to reassess my position in regard to the Hearings on the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Plant. Although at times I had considered discussing aspects of the situation with members of the Regulatory Staff and/or the Commission, prudence dictated otherwise lest some ulterior motive(s) should be read into my decision. I realize that attempts will be made to "find" reasons other than the central one which I will present and I can only urge everyone concerned (as well as those only mildly interested) to accept my explanation at face value. It will soon become apparent that the following has not been calculated to please but rather to be objective and realistic. It represents the result of some very serious deliberations and was not arrived at easily.

I would be remiss in not pointing out that my failure to be present during most of the sessions during the week of January 25th was prompted not only by a very heavy load of commitments to various teaching and research responsibilities but by the beginnings of the above-mentioned reappraisal of the situation. I will now attempt to describe my present position.

As some of you may remember I had become drawn into the present controversy because I had thought that the utility in question was engaged in an attempt to deny the potential for danger inherent in the utilization of radiation and they in turn believed that such concern should not necessarily be expressed by a geneticist. Be that as it may, and in spite of a degree of bitterness which has developed on all sides and which I would sooner forget, we now find ourselves as Interveners at the current Hearings.

Needless to say, certain discrete events of the past several weeks have played a significant role in influencing my line of thinking; however, these should only be regarded as contributory rather than direct causes. The seriousness with which the AEC Regulatory Staff headed by Mr. Thomas Englehardt has considered all the issues raised and the care which the Board chaired by Mr. Walter Skallerup has sought to hold a fair and just hearing (as exemplified by the decision on the applicant's request for a temporary construction permit) are amongst many of the other things which have impressed me. Moreover, when it became apparent that Dr. Dean Parker, a long-time scientific colleague, who incidentally also happens to work with fruit flies like myself, and I would find ourselves at seemingly opposite ends of the scientific spectrum, my decision to withdraw as an Intervener from this Hearing and as a future witness for the Lloyd Harbor Study Group began to be formed.

Since views on the biological effects of ionizing radiation held officially by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and I do not differ in essentials I cannot with a clear conscience see how my scientific expertise can be utilized to resolve what I consider to be one of the major issues of these Hearings, namely, whether the benefits to be derived from the proposed plant outweigh the potential risks, no matter how large or small. From a purely personal point of view, my concern has never been with the quantitative aspects of the situation. While I still feel that even one life is sacred and has no price, it has become painfully obvious to me that this evaluation must be resolved on other than purely scientific grounds by society as a whole, and not by a single or a group of individuals, no matter how sincere and intense their feelings may be.

In view of this line of reasoning it necessarily follows that I should endorse the recommendations of the Regulatory Staff concerning the proposed application for a construction permit as being entirely consistent with what has transpired up to now in these Hearings. I have become convinced that the present plant will be built in conformity with the majority of society's current views on life and living.

Respectfully Submitted

Irwin I. Oster
Bowling Green, Ohio
February 8, 1971