

Docket No. 50-320

OCT 15 1980

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket No. 50-320
NRC PDR
Local PDR
TERA
TMIPO r/f
TMI Site r/f
BJSnyder
JTCollins
OLynch
Pleech
Rweller
MDuncan
Attorney, ELD
HThompson

Mr. R. C. Arnold
Senior Vice President
Attn: George Mencinski
Metropolitan Edison Company
100 Interpace Parkway
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054

Dear Mr. Arnold:

As specified in the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, we have requested Federal, State, and local agencies to comment in connection with the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement related to decontamination and disposal of radioactive wastes resulting from March 28, 1979, accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2.

The enclosure to this letter contains a list of comments received subsequent to my transmittal letter of October 6, 1980.

Please review these comments and submit any responses you deem appropriate by October 31, 1980. Your reply should consist of three signed originals and twenty additional copies.

Sincerely,

Bernard J. Snyder, Program Director
Three Mile Island Program Office
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
List of Comments Transmitted

cc w/encl:
George F. Trowbridge, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
1800 M. Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS
POOR QUALITY PAGES

8010290356

P

OFFICE	TMIPO	TMIPO	TMIPO	DIR TMIPO	
SURNAME	MDuncan/hmt	Pleech	OLynch	BJSnyder	
DATE	10/9/80	10/9/80	10/9/80	10/14/80	

List of Comments Transmitted

Name of Facility: Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2

Licensee: Metropolitan Edison Company
Jersey Central Power and Light Company
Pennsylvania Electric Company

Docket No.: 50-320

Documents Transmitted:

16. Steven C. Sholly, et al, letter, dated September 17, 1980.
18. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers letter, dated September 25, 1980.
19. Robert Jay Lifton letter, dated September 20, 1980.
20. Susquehanna Valley Alliance comment received October 6, 1980.
21. Commonwealth of Virginia, Council on the Environment letter, dated October 1, 1980.
22. Walden S. Randall letter, dated September 29, 1980.

OFFICE	SURNAME	DATE				

16
1536 16th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

September 17, 1980

President Jimmy Carter
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We are writing on behalf of fifteen national organizations and thirty-one Mid-Atlantic groups which are distressed about your administration's handling of the damaged Three Mile Island Nuclear power station.

As you yourself have accepted the responsibility to protect the public health and safety of the citizens in the area affected by TMI, we believe that it is incumbent upon your office to take steps to end the exclusion of the public in deciding how the radioactive decontamination of TMI-2 will proceed.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has consistently and effectively precluded the public from adequate participation in the analysis, and subsequent decision making process, concerning the cleanup of TMI-2. Examples include:

1. The purchase and installation of the Epicor-II system by Metropolitan Edison before the method was approved by NRC.
2. Time constraints imposed in the decision making for the purging of krypton-85, in spite of a majority of comments opposing the purging alternative.
3. NRC's failure to follow up on its promise to form a citizen advisory committee with funding for independent scientific review.

On August 14, 1980, the NRC released a staff report entitled, "Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) related to decontamination and disposal of radioactive wastes resulting from March 28, 1979, accident Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (NUREG-0683)".

This is perhaps the most important health and environment-related document the U.S. Government has issued about decontaminating the crippled reactor. It is essential that a sufficient period of time be permitted for both the public and independent scientists to examine and analyze the cleanup options dealing with ultimate disposal of contaminated water, decontamination

of the facility, removal and disposal of the damaged core, and storage, processing, and transportation of radioactive wastes. The public comment period on this extensive draft is limited to 45 days. In our view, the comment period should be extended to a minimum of 90 days to allow the public and scientific community time to respond in a meaningful manner.

There are basic flaws in the PEIS which cannot be properly addressed through the public comment process and must, instead, be resolved through further studies by the NRC with subsequent public review and comment.

Some basic flaws in the PEIS which might require separate environmental impact statements:

1. The problem of how and where to dispose of the wastes resulting from the accident and cleanup process is inadequately considered. There is no assurance that any waste site will accept the low-level waste in the amount postulated by the NRC staff and ultimate disposal of high-level waste remains an unresolved question.
2. The NRC staff dismisses the question of whether TMI-2 will be decommissioned or prepared for restart by stating that it is not within the scope of the PEIS. In reality the methods of cleanup are very dependent on the decision to restart or to decommission the unit. Certain processes could severely damage the equipment, making the final disposition question essential in selecting the proper methods to be used. Thus the question of restart or decommissioning of the plant must be considered in depth within the PEIS.
3. There is a total lack of cost estimates in this evaluation phase of the PEIS. The NRC staff has promised that the cost factors will be provided in the final PEIS (after the period for public comment has passed). The lack of opportunity for public comment on economic aspects of the cleanup provides an example of how the public is being excluded from the decision making process. In view of the precarious financial condition of Metropolitan Edison, the NRC's assertions that costs are not a limiting factor can hardly be viewed as realistic.
4. In the PEIS the NRC makes the assumption that cesium and strontium from the planned release of processed water (which will contaminate Chesapeake Bay seafood as far south as the Potomac river) will not effect the marketability of the seafood. A separate EIS that includes market research data on radioactivity in Chesapeake Bay seafood must be performed prior to making any determinations as to the effects of radioactive contamination of Bay seafood on the seafood industry.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has stated that a public hearing is not anticipated and not indicated in this matter. We feel that this position is indefensible and that public hearings must be held on this in accord with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, which call for such hearings when there is "substantial environmental controversy concerning the proposed action or substantial interest in holding the hearing. 40 CFR § 1506.6(c)(1).

We ask that your Office of Consumer Affairs convey to the NRC the fact that it is in the public interest to extend the public comment period and hold public hearings in this matter. The hearings should be held in Harrisburg or Middletown,

PA, in Baltimore, MD, and in Washington, D.C., and should be recorded and incorporated into the NRC's final evaluation of the PEIS.

We further request that funds be appropriated to enable us to hire independent scientists to review the proposed cleanup methods. This "critical review and public assessment" will assist the NRC in evaluating the safety and feasibility of the TMI-2 cleanup, and will provide for public review of this lengthy and difficult process.

Requests Outlined:

1. Meeting with you to discuss your role in protecting the public during the decontamination of TMI-2.
2. Extension of the public comment period on the PEIS to a minimum of 90 days.
3. NRC (legislative) public hearings to be held on the radioactive decontamination of TMI-2.
4. Funds allocated for independent scientists (selected by our citizens' group) to review the PEIS on TMI-2.

We look forward to your response.

Respectfully,

Steven C. Sholly

Steven C. Sholly, Director
TMI-Public Interest Resource Center
Harrisburg, PA

John Kabler

John Kabler
Maryland Ad Hoc Committee on TMI
Baltimore, MD

Richard P. Pollock (pb)

Richard P. Pollock, Director
Critical Mass Energy Project
Washington, D.C.

Betsy Taylor

Betsy Taylor, Director
Nuclear Information & Resource Service
Washington, D.C.

Representatives of the following
endorsers (names attached)

cc: TMI Program Office, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

bcc: U.S. NRC Commissioners
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
U.S. Department of Energy
Governor Dick Thornburg of Pennsylvania
Governor Harry Hughes of Maryland
Pennsylvania State Department of Environmental Resources
Maryland State Department of Natural Resources

Endorsers of the preceding letter:

Three Mile Island-Public Interest Resource Center, Harrisburg, PA
Three Mile Island - Legal Fund, Harrisburg, PA
Three Mile Island Alert, Harrisburg, PA
People Against Nuclear Energy, Middletown, PA
Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, State College, PA
Anti-Nuclear Group Representing York, York, PA
Newberry Township TMI Steering Committee, Newberry Town, PA
Susquehanna Valley Alliance, Lancaster, PA

Indian Point New York Public Interest Resource Group, New York, New York
Greater New York Council on Energy, New York
General Assembly to Stop the Power Lines, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Citizens Hearings for Radiation Victims, Washington, DC

Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Annapolis, MD
Maryland Conservation Council, Maryland
Maryland Watermens Association, Annapolis, MD
Baltimore Chapter of Sierra Club, Baltimore, MD
Clean Water Action Project, Baltimore, MD
Coalition of Peninsula Organizations, Baltimore, MD
Upper Chesapeake Watershed Association, Cecil County, MD
Chesapeake Energy Alliance, Baltimore, MD
Bay Alliance for Safe Energy, Ann Arundel County, MD
Peachbottom Alliance, Hartford County, MD
Political Awareness Committee, Baltimore Friends School, Baltimore Maryland
Patuxent Alliance, Columbia, MD
Howard County Peace Action Community, Howard County, MD

Audubon Naturalist Society of the Central Atlantic States, Chevy Chase, MD
DC Public Interest Research Group, Washington, DC
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Washington, DC(chapter)
Potomac Alliance, Washington, DC
Washington, Area of Clergy and Laity Concerned, Washington, DC

Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, MA
Natural Resources Defense Council, Washington, DC
Environmental Action Foundation, Washington, DC
Environmental Policy Center, Washington, DC
Friends of the Earth, Washington, DC
Citizens Energy Project, Washington, DC
Clean Water Action Project, Washington, DC
Institute for Ecological Policies, Washington, DC
Institute for Local Self-Reliance, Washington, DC
Mobilization for Survival, Washington, DC
Karen Silkwood Fund, Washington, DC and Christic Institute, Washington, DC
Washington Peace Center, Washington, DC
Women Strike For Peace, Washington, DC
Environmentalists For Full Employment, Washington, DC