



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
BALTIMORE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P. O. BOX 1715
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21203

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF
NABPL-E

25 September 1980

Mr. Bernard J. Snyder
Program Director
Three Mile Island Program Office
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
United States Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Snyder:

This letter is in response to your Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Docket No. 50-320, which was received in our office on 16 September 1980. Comments are directed toward the five alternatives, which are presently under consideration, for the decontamination and disposal of radio-active wastes.

This agency's areas of concern are flood control hazard potentials, permit requirements under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and other direct and indirect impacts on Corps of Engineers existing and/or proposed projects. In accordance with these responsibilities, our office has the following comments:

- a. The Baltimore District, Corps of Engineers, maintains responsibility for certain water resource projects in the Susquehanna River Basin. Presently, we do not have any projects, studies, or proposed studies in the immediate Three Mile Island area or downstream from the plant. The nearest study we have underway is for local flood protection for Harrisburg. As this is located approximately 10 miles upstream from the Three Mile Island plant, no impacts upon the local flood protection project are anticipated.
- b. Another responsibility of the Baltimore District is to review the need for permits for construction projects which might affect both wetlands and navigable waters. The construction that is being proposed for the plant will not require any permits from this office. It has also been determined that proposed construction will be located above the determined flood plain levels.

The Baltimore District appreciates the opportunity to comment on your Draft Environmental Statement and if we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

William E. Trieschman, Jr.
WILLIAM E. TRIESCHMAN, Jr.
Chief, Planning Division

8010290357

[Faint handwritten text]

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
25 Park Street
Department of Psychiatry

September 20, 1980

Continued:

I am writing in response to your Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement of July 1980, on the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station unit two. I am concerned here only with the sections on Psychological Stress and Psychological Effects.

While these two sections contain much that is accurate, they distort the question of the psychological impact of traumatic events in several ways.

They will emphasize on anxiety in relationship to disasters, and especially on the potential possibility of panic, leaving out the very important question of recovery. In extensive work that I and others have done on disasters of various kinds, we have found that a certain amount of fear and tension is totally essential for taking constructive action in the direction of saving lives and helping people. Too much fear, or extreme anxiety, can of course be harmful, but the inability to experience or recognize danger—the apparent absence of fear—can be equally dangerous, and can take the form of extreme numbness and denial, and lead to highly ineffectual behavior.

In a similar way your repeated use of the term "phobia," as in such phrases as "nuclear phobia" and "phobic reactions," is in a related distortion. Deep concern about continuing danger, or the possibility that any lead to renewed danger, is perceived with an irrational extreme "phobia." The main question this kind of description in relationship to any traumatic situation, but especially so in relationship to nuclear accidents or disasters.

Now there is a question of the very real and often effects, there is inevitably response of continuing fear. This has been true not only in Hiroshima, but also with military service men exposed to nuclear weapons tests, minors exposed to nuclear, and ordinary people exposed to just weapons testing in Nevada and Utah. Since scientific authorities on the effects of radiation themselves disagree—and in fact there is no way of determining exact effects—we cannot label continuing fear of these effects as "irrational" or "phobic." They are in considerable degree a very real response to an abnormal situation.

Finally, I would emphasize—and your report is deficient in not acknowledging this—these "phobic" reactions would not take the form of a clear-cut medical or even psychiatric "disorder." Rather, they express themselves in various combinations

