

The House of Charles

90 Nittany Drive

Mechanicsburg, Pa. 17055
November 4, 1980

SO-320P



Dr. Bernard J. Snyder, Program Director
Three Mile Island Program Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

NOV 10 11 10 55

COMMUNICATIONS
SERVICES
BRANCH

Dear Mr. Snyder,

I know that the NRC is interested in our comments and questions on the Environmental Impact Statement. After reading the EIS, I have the following questions and/or comments.

1. Why has Cumberland County been left out of the total EIS (3-191)? You have given no information on the population, geography, etc. is given for Cumberland County. Please use the 1980 census statistics instead of 1970 census statistics for the final EIS.

No mention is made of two major military installations in the area - New Cumberland Army Depot and the Mechanicsburg Navy Depot. What would happen if these facilities were forced to close because of another accident at TMI Unit II? Many employees of these depots did leave the area during March 1979. It seems strange to me that you discuss Lancaster and even Gettysburg, but do not give any consideration to these military installations.

2. Where will the high and low level waste materials from the Unit II cleanup be sent? It is general knowledge that the Hanford Washington will probably not be available after 1981 for nuclear plant waste. (NUREG 0732)

I was glad to see that you had a new map for the route to be used for waste transportation. (Question 110) However, I do not like your answer, "Currently the truck goes...". What about future use? Will you use the route shown in the EIS draft?

On page 2-1 you state, "It is unlikely that the site could be qualified as a candidate high-level waste repository site because of such factors as nearby population densities and hydrology." ~~This has~~ disturbed many of us. What is the difference between site selection for high level waste and site selection for a nuclear power plant? At a meeting in Swarata Township John Collins stated that it is possible that we could have nuclear waste at TMI for 50 to 60 years. To my children and I this represents a rather permanent storage site.

2019
S
1/0

8011120380

H

Is the waste that is stored on the island considered to be safe from air traffic accidents? The NRC said that the reactor buildings were safe from air collision, how about the waste materials and the pools of water in which the rods are to be kept? The Harrisburg International Airport was not mentioned in the EIS draft.

3. Met-Ed has slowed clean up operations and reduced staff because of financial problems. When does the NRC step in to keep the clean up operations going and to maintain a pace the NRC has considered to be so important? What will happen to the clean up and the plant if Met-Ed goes bankrupt?

4. What ever happened to the evacuation plans? It has been over 18 months since the accident and the public has still not been informed or issued evacuation plans. Why wasn't an evacuation plan part of the EIS? At no place in the EIS is the possibility of evacuation due to problems during clean up mentioned?

5. Can Unit I be used to help in the cleanup of Unit II? For example, could Unit I be used to store waste water, could storage pools be used, or could it help provide better security? Is it hazardous to have Unit I go back on line prior to having Unit II cleaned-up? Should information on Unit I be included in the final EIS? It seems that public officials do not want to discuss Unit I because of the hearings on Unit I restart.

6. Figure 3.1-2. Cumberland County and its county seat, Carlisle are not on the map. Neither is Mechanicsburg, where the Naval Supply Depot is located or New Cumberland, where the Army Depot is located. The corrected map on page 24 of the Question and Answer Booklet should be corrected to show TMI in Dauphin and not Lebanon County.

7. Many of your references are secondary references. For example, in References--Sec. 3.1, reference 3 is a geology text book, "Structural Geology of North America." Please include the state, federal, and contracted studies in your reference list. Use original sources.

Much of what you use from Reference 1, is outdated material and should be checked before being used. What is the geology 1000 feet down? Should you know this information if you are going to store waste in the area?

I was also concerned about you references for weather and hydrology. I hope your weather information is based on more than Reference 9 - Local Climatological Data. Shouldn't you have additional weather data if you are to release krypton, etc.? What are the upper winds aloof, etc.?

Concerning hydrology (3-6) I think you should check your information on the pump storage facility consisting of two reservoirs and dams scheduled for completion in 1980-1984. Please update the Stony Creek Project. Will this change your flood forecast for TMI? What is the height of the dike or flood wall around the island and the waste storage areas?

I have the aerial photographs of Three Mile Island during the flood of June 1972. On the photographs it appears as if most of the island was covered. Is this true. Is it true that the bridges and access to the plant were inundated?

8. On page 3-24 you state that "The continuing tension seems related to two issues: future decommissioning plans for TMI-2, and a distrust of those responsible for these activities." I think that you have neglected to mention another source of tension and that is the prospect of Unit 1 being allowed to restart. Living in the shadow of the TMI towers is bad enough at the present time without having the additional threat of another accident at the plant being a part of our lives. The estimated time for cleanup is 7 to 10 years this alone is enough to cause stress for many of us.

9. Where are the containers holding resins from the Epicor II being stored? I have recently read from Inside NRC that radioactive decay of isotopes stored in some of the containers on site may be causing the resins to degrade into a jelly-like matter that could emit gases and cause the canisters to corrode. The possible solution to this dilemma was said to be onsite incineration. Would this incineration release additional radiation into the atmosphere?

Now that we have lived through the week long venting of krypton, and continue to live with the almost weekly ventings of additional krypton do we have yet another large emission of radioactive gas to look forward to?

Sincerely yours,

Edwin Charles Mary Ann Charles
Edwin and Mary Ann Charles

cc: Gus Speth
Allen Ertel
Bill Goodling
Governor Thornburg