

JAN 14 1979

Mrs. Jeff Broady
Brownville, Nebraska 68321

Dear Mrs. Broady:

I am pleased to respond to your letter to the President regarding the radiation doses to people that may result from the uptake by cattle of radioactive material to be released from the stack of the Cooper Nuclear Plant.

On June 5, 1968, the Commission (AEC) issued a permit to Consumers Public Power District authorizing the construction of the plant. We understand that during the summer of 1979, Consumers will apply for an AEC license to operate the plant. The license would limit the quantities of radioactive materials released from the plant to assure that the resulting radiation exposures to people by way of food (including beef and milk), air and water would not exceed the limits of our regulations. The principal bases for our regulations in this area (Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 20) are the radiation protection guides developed by the Federal Radiation Council (FRC) and approved by the President for the guidance of all federal agencies. Representatives of the AEC's Division of Compliance routinely inspect plant operations (including radioactive material releases) on a periodic basis to assure that they are in accordance with terms of the license and AEC regulations.

Surveillance programs at nuclear power plants now operating indicate that releases of radioactivity from these plants have generally been small percentages of limits imposed under AEC regulations. The quantities released are so low that, even in areas near nuclear power plants it has been difficult to measure, through environmental monitoring programs carried out by some of the states, by the U. S. Public Health Service and by the AEC, any increases in radioactivity above natural background levels that could be attributed to nearby nuclear power plants. In 1979--two years before the scheduled commercial operation of the plant--Consumers will begin their preoperational monitoring of the environment (including air, soil, vegetation, milk, ground water and other matter) for radioactive materials to determine natural background levels. Consumers will

Mrs. Jeff Broady

continue their environmental radiation monitoring program during commercial operations to assure that levels of radioactivity in the environment are kept well within radiation protection guides.

I am enclosing booklets which explain the licensing, safety, and environmental effects of nuclear power plants. If we can supply further information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Peter A. Morris, Director
Division of Reactor Licensing

Enclosures:

- 1. 10 CFR Part 20
- 2. "Licensing of Power Reactors"
- 3. "Atomic Power Safety"
- 4. "Nuclear Power and the Environment"

Distribution
H. L. Price
P. A. Morris
L. D. Low
L. R. Rogers
PDR (30-298)

DR 2423

EGRSTB:DRL

HEHaddican:bc
1/7/70

OFFICE:	EGRSTB:DRL P. J. Howe	RT:DRL R. DeYoung	CO. L. Kornblath	RT:DRL S. Levine	RPS	DRL P. A. Morris
DATE:	1/7/70	1/12/70	1/12/70	1/12/70	1/8/70	1/7/70

Mrs. Jeff Broady

- 2 -

continue their environmental radiation monitoring program during commercial operations to assure that levels of radioactivity in the environment are kept well within radiation protection guides.

I am enclosing booklets which explain the licensing, safety, and environmental effects of nuclear power plants. If we can supply further information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Peter A. Morris, Director
Division of Reactor Licensing

Enclosures:

1. 10 CFR Part 20
2. "Licensing of Power Reactors"
3. "Atomic Power Safety"
4. "Nuclear Power and the Environment"

Distribution

H. L. Price
 P. A. Morris
 L. D. Low
 L. R. Rogers
 PDR (50-298)

DR 2423

E&RSTB:DRL

VEHaddican:bc
1/7/70

OFFICE:	E&RSTB:DRL	RT:DRL	CO.	RT:DRL	RPS	DRL
SURNAMC:	P. J. Howe	R. DeYoung	L. Kornblath	S. Levine		P. A. Morris
DATE:	1/7/70	1/12/70	1/12/70	1/12/70	1/8/70	1/12/70

Brownville, Nebraska
February 10, 1970

Paul C. Tompkins
Executive Director
Federal Radiation Council
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Tompkins,

I hope you will find my letter, I am an extremely
confused person - and more than a bit frightened.

In brief our situation is this - we live 1800 feet
under the "disposal stack" of the Cooper Nuclear
Power Plant now under construction near Brownville,
Nebraska. We raise corn and feed out cattle for a
living. This plant will have a big one, with talk of
more plants in the future. Already Gen. News Public
has shown it will be the biggest from Chicago to the
West Coast.

Our home is directly under the Stack, so to speak, and
is wind drift. Our farm yards are even closer to the
stack than we are. Our weather sees a high incidence
of heavy fog - actually, I think some wild geese caught
in this fog when it was so thick that they couldn't
find a way out. And the weather sometimes stays like
this for days and days.

What will happen to the "waste product release" during
this type of weather? Won't it be trapped right on us?

Incidentally, we will have no state monitoring of either
our air or the river water that the plant will use. I
suspect a personal friendship with Mr. Cooper and our
governor forestalls any action or cooperation on their
part with us who live adjacent to the plant. Our governor
ridicules such monitoring as a waste of money. This plant
will have absolute freedom of control from any outside
source - and this is so dangerous.

But I am saying here is - the very people who will run
this plant do not realize the character of the materials
they are working with - and that really leaves us to the
mercy of unwashed hands.

February 20, 1970

Mrs. Jeff Dredy
Brownville, Nebraska 68021

Dear Mrs. Dredy:

This is in reply to your letter of February 10, 1970. As you may know, the AEC is charged by law with protecting the health and safety of the public in all applications of nuclear energy and its by-product radioactive material. The AEC, in turn, has devised, as its procedure and regulatory standards to comply with the Federal guidance recommended by the FRC. Among the requirements is a requirement for the licensee to provide a comprehensive safety analysis that will demonstrate that, under all operating conditions, possible maximum exposure of the public has been reduced to well within permissible limits and that the fission products will be retained within the plant in case there is a malfunction in the reactor. The licensee must also do enough monitoring to convince the Commission that the conditions prescribed in the license are met. This requirement is independent of whether a state chooses to maintain an independent surveillance program of its own. Independent measurements, for example by the U. S. Public Health Service, have confirmed the adequacy of these provisions on power reactors operating in the U. S.

The FRC thinks in terms of relative safety rather than absolute safety. In setting its basic guideline involving possible exposures of the public, the FRC selected a value of risk that was judged to be so low that it could be accepted each year for a lifetime if there was any benefit from the activity causing the exposure. To the extent that radiation — both naturally occurring and man-made — has medical or genetic significance to a family or a locality the following information may help you establish your own perspective on the relative risk of living close to a nuclear power plant.

Millirad per year
(a unit of radiation exposure)

Annual dose rate in populated
parts of the world from
naturally occurring sources 80 to 1,500

Average annual dose rate in
U.S. from naturally
occurring sources 100 to 175

Average annual per capita
dose from medical procedures 55

Average annual per capita
dose from weapons testing
(fallout) 3 to 5

Average annual dose to the most
exposed segment of the popula-
tion from existing nuclear
power plants 1 to 2

Dose per jet flight from the
West coast to the East coast 1 to 2

Based on experience with the AEC regulatory program, I
would expect the controls on the Cooper Nuclear Power plant
to be at least as exacting as those on plants already in
production. From consideration of the comparative risk
from various sources of environmental radiation alone, I

- 3 -

would expect the power plant to have no effect justifying
concern for the safety of your family and children, neighbors,
agricultural crops or livestock and poultry.

I hope you find this information responsive to your
questions and obvious concern. If we can be of further
assistance, please do not hesitate to write again.

Sincerely,

Paul C. Thompson
Executive Director

PCT:jp 2-20-70

Brownville, Nebr.
Feb. 28, 1970

Mr. Paul Tompkins
Executive Director
Federal Radiation Council
Washington, D.C.

MAR 10 1972
RECEIVED

Dear Mr. Tompkins,

Thank you for your answer to my questions concerning our safety in living so very close to the dispersal tower of the Cooper Nuclear Power Plant of Brownville, Nebraska.

I've followed this thing for several months, from the local to state government - Consumer's Public Power - The AEC - Environmental Information of St. Louis - Harold Hughes, federal level - University of California - etc. -etc. This will be my last letter.

You end up on top of this totem pole.

You know and I know that the entire nuclear reactor program is based upon " benefits vs. risks ". This was evident when I read the Staff Report #1 of the Federal Radiation Council.

We also know that only an idiot would live 1500 feet under the tower.

Now it has been charged that the risk element is much larger than anyone expected. Included in this risk element seems a certainty of genetic consequences that, like the top of an iceberg, we may be seeing but a part of.

Small accidents are showing up all over the United States, in regards to these reactors - what happens when the big accident comes ?

You could stop this madness, you could recommend that the radioactive output of these plants be reduced considerably.

Who gives you the right to make gunia pigs out of all of us?

Are you God ?