

Mary Lou Griffith  
313 Prospect Ave. - B5  
Bridgeport, Pa. 19405

March 19, 1981



U.S. NATIONAL REGULATORY COMMISSION  
1717 H Street  
N.W. Washington, D.C. 20555

Gentlemen:

I've heard that the NRC is considering restarting TMI-1 while TMI-2 is being cleaned up. I'm opposed to this idea.

If TMI-1 has an accident, the entire site, including TMI-2, may have to be abandoned during the clean-up. And if TMI-2 has another accident during the clean-up, use of the facilities the reactors share will be complicated by having Unit 1 in operation.

Since MET ED can get its electricity from other companies in the PJM system, why must we impose extra hazards just so MET ED utility investors can get more money from the rate-payers by putting TMI-1 back in the rate base?

I believe the investors should bear the full costs of a clean-up that proceeds as safely as possible. The Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee thinks we should bill American taxpayers to bail out MET ED. Another plan would have customers of nuclear utilities pay extra to cover this accident and future ones. But the rate- and taxpayers had no choice in some utilities' risky decision to go nuclear. If TMI had run smoothly, the investors would not have shared their profits with us. Why, then, should we share their clean-up losses with them? That goes against our free enterprise ideal.

Please oppose any plans to make ratepayers and taxpayers compensate for MET ED's bad investment.

Thank you  
*Mary Lou Griffith*  
Mary Lou Griffith



DS03  
S/D