# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### BEFORE THE COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY	) Docket No. 50-289
(Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1)	(Restart)

### TMIA'S RESPONSE TO LICENSEE'S MOTION WITH RESPECT TO PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH ISSUE

By Motion dated May 24, 1982, the Licensee moves the Commission to complete "as promptly as possible" a determination whether a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) on psychological health effects of operating TMI-1 is required, and if so required, moves that the SEIS be completed without "trial type public hearings." Licensee also moves that the Commission set firm, early deadlines for determining if the SEIS is required and for completion of the draft SEIS, and urges that if an SEIS is required, "the Commission should conclude that the potential psychological health effects associated with potential delay of TMI-2 clean-up greatly outweigh the potential psychological health effects of restart of TMI-1." TMIA urges the Commission to deny this extraordinarily presumptuous Motion. quite clear that if the Commission adopts the suggestions of the Licensee, the agency will be in blatant violation of NEPA's requirement that it act in good faith, and the Atomic Energy Act's requirement that it protect the public health and safety.

The Licensee urges that the Commission set deadlines for completion of their decision-making responsibilities, suggesting June 15, 1982

8206090087 820603 PDR ADDCK 05000289 0303

for a determination whether an SEIS is needed, and July 15, 1982 for completion of a draft SFIS. Obviously, if adopted, these would be extremely short deadlines particularly considereing the unique nature of the NEPA issues involved. But also, the Commissioners should be aware that whether or not such deadlines appear reasonable to them, they are not perceived as such by area residents. In fact, when such short deadlines were discussed by the Staff at the scoping meeting held with Newberrytown citizens and TMIA members, the meeting attendees became extremely upset. The general feeling was that the Staff was more interested in placating the Licensee by meeting short deadlines than in doing a thorough environmental assessment (EA). This perception visibly increased anxiety and certainly added to the high levels of mental and emotional distress already felt by those attending the meeting. The Commission must realize that its actions in this case directly impact upon the psychological health effects which it is examining, and should be extremely cautious not to do things which exacerbate the feelings of distrust already felt by area residents.

TMIA does not object to a prompt completion of the EA or SEIS, but maintains that the Commission's first priority under NEPA must be thoroughness and accuracy, particularly if the Commission is concerned about unnecessary delay. Nothing will produce more extended delays than a court challenge to the EA or the SEIS resulting in a court order to redo either document. Thus, it certainly appears to be in both the Licensee's and the NRC's interest for the Commission to aim solely towards thoroughness and accuracy in preparation of these documents, however long it may take.

The Licensee further states "formal trial-type public hearings would add nothing of value to the Commission's decision-making process

THE

17.753

presumptuous and outrageous that is deserves little comment. Suffice it to say that neither the utility not the Commission have any idea at this point what value a public hearing could have in assisting in preparation of an SEIS. Actually, it will likely have tremendous value given the nature of the psychological health issue. But certainly the Commission must not make such decisions until the EA is completed.

The Licensee also states that "the Commission should conclude" that the potential delay of TMI-2 clean-up greatly outweighs the potential psychological health effects of restart of TMI-1." This is an incredible statement. TMIA wonders whether the Licensee is unaware of, or merely consciously ignores the fact that voters in the three counties surrounding TMI recently voted 2 to 1 against the restart of TMI-1. While the desire to get TMI-2 cleaned-up is certainly strong, the sentiment against restart is overwhelming. In the face of this referendum vote, and lack of a supportable basis for the Licensee's position, the Commission would be plainly acting in bad faith by adopting such a "conclusion."

TMIA does not agree with the Licensee's characterization of the TMI-1 restart case as "extraordinary." However, even if true, this would not relieve the Commission of its obligation to comply with the law. Licensee's Motion should be denied, and its urgings should be rejected.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 3, 1982

Louise Bradford, TMIA

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### BEFORE THE COMMISSION

In the Matter of		
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY	Docket No. 50-289 (Restart)	
(Three Mile Island Nuclear ) Station, Unit No. 1)	(Nescare)	

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "TMIA's Response to Licensee's Motion with Respect to Psychological Health Issue", dated June 3, 1982 was served upon those persons on the attached ServiceList by deposit in the United States mail, postage prepaid, or as indicated by asterisk, by had this 7th day of June, 1982.

Louise Bradford do

S RIDAY

mme!

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY,

(Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1) Docket No. 50-289 (Restart)

## SERVICE LIST

- Docketing and Service Section
  Office of the Secretary
  U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
  Washington, D.C. 20555
- \* Ivan W. Smith, Esquire, Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Walter H. Jordan Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel 881 West Outer Drive Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Dr. Linda W. Little Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel 5000 Hermitage Drive Raleigh, North Carolina 27512

- \* George F. Trowbridge, Esquire Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge 1800 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006
- James A. Tourtellotte, Esquire
  Office of the Executive Legal Director
  U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
  Washington, D.C. 20555
  - \* Ellyn R. Weiss Harmon & Weiss 1725 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 506 Washington, D.C. 20006
    - William S. Jorden, III, Esq. Harmon & Weiss
      1725 I St. N.W., Suite 506
      Washington, D.C. 20555

Ms. Marjorie M. Aamodt R.D. #5 Coatesville, Pennsylvania 19320

Ms. Gail Bradford Anti-Nuclear Group Representing York 245 West Philadelphia Street York, Pennsylvania 17404

Q3618048-

STORES L

Dr. Chauncey Kepford & Judith Johnsrud Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power 433 Orlando Avenue State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Mr. Steven C. Sholly Union of Concerned Scientists 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Dupont Circle Building, Suite 1101 Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert W. Adler, Esq. Assistant Attorney General 505 Executive House P.O. Box 2357 Harrisburg, PA 17120

Jordan D. Curningham, Esquire Attorney for Newberry Township T.M.I. Steering Committee 2320 North Second Street Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110 \* Nunzio J. Palladino, Chairman U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

1 . . .

1901

CONTRACT CARCINE

L'ANDRES

DEPHARES

11 1224-

- Hi

STATE OF THE

20.000000

- \* Victor Gilinsky, Commissioner U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555
- \* James K. Asselstine, Commissioner U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555
- \* John F. Ahearne, Commissioner U.S. NUclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C.
- \* Thomas Roberts, Commissioner U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555
- \* Administrative Judge Gary J. Edles Chairman, ASLAB U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555
- \* Administrative Judge John H. Buck ASLAB U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washinton, D.C. 20555