

TO: Secretary of the
Commission

50-320
FM: T. ELSASSER,
MIDDLETOWN OFFICE

Once again, the NRC is disregarding the wishes of the people of Middletown and the surrounding area. Clear citizen opposition has been voiced to the venting of Krypton. Even clearer opposition has been voiced to long-term venting, should venting in fact be necessary. And what does the NRC say it is about to decide? Long term venting, over 30 to 60 days. This is outrageous.

The NRC says it hasn't yet decided--but it's been doing a pro-venting public opinion campaign for months--in closed groups with selected leaders. The NRC says it is concerned about psychological stress among the people here, but proposes venting over one to two months--a long time to be disrupted if you're worried about venting and a lot of people here are. This is outrageous.

The irony is that we wouldn't have to be talking about venting now, if the NRC had started moving on alternatives last year, soon after the accident. Instead, they didn't even start on an Environmental Assessment, yet, until November of 1979. And they blame us for delaying the venting? This is outrageous.

A couple of points to make quite clear. First, we are not trying to tie up the clean up, to create delays unnecessarily. We agree with some of our seemingly pro-nuke friends that a speedy, responsible clean up is exactly what is called for. Speedy, and responsible. Second, there are good options.

--MORE--

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS
POOR QUALITY PAGES

8008190036

If venting is indeed called for, there are at least two alternatives that could be used in a short time frame. One is the "fast" venting, over 5 to 14 days. The other is one of the UCS alternatives--heating the gas inside containment with an incinerator, so that it would rise farther than otherwise when released, and would therefore reduce the radiation dose to us, the people near the plant. Neither of these alternatives would cause the considerable economic dislocation which the long--60 day--venting would. Imagine wondering if you can afford a forced ^{vacation} of up to two months with your family, or being a motel owner, and wondering about your business over the two best tourist months of the year.

Neither the fast venting nor the heated fast venting would create these problems. They would, most likely, have to be carried out in the Fall--because of wind patterns, or with the hot alternative, the need to put in an incinerator. This is a short delay, and any problems the delay might cause people could be counterbalanced by making a clear schedule for releases, so that people could make plans, could cope. And the short delay would be more than counterbalanced by reducing the period of threat from the intolerable 30 to 60 days the NRC is proposing.

We hear that the NRC doesn't like the fast venting alternatives we're backing here because they might have to have a public hearing, so that they could waive technical specifications on daily radiation releases. And they are terrified

of public hearings. So they'll subject us to up to 60 days of venting threat, because they're afraid--of the public? Well, that really is outrageous, and that's why we're bringing the public to them, here, today.

9 June 1980, Middletown

MARCH 28 COALITION

Contact: Pat Smith 938-6923

Bob Colman 238-4492

Shelly Saunders 397-5314