

Brownville, Nebraska

Jan. 5, 1972

Mr. Lester Rogers
Dir., Div. Radiological & Environmental Protection
Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington D. C.

Dear Mr. Rogers,

Thank you for your letter of Dec. 22. As you may recall, we are the people who have a feed yard within the boundary lines of the Cooper Nuclear Station.

You did not answer any of my specific questions - I have your general answers to my questions, they are one and all the same since there is a large size controversy on whether or not the standards set by the NRC are sufficient to guarantee public health in this area in any amount of radiation, you cannot assure me of safety in our situation. To do so would be to irresponsible in the extreme, because there perhaps is life and death here. And you know this.

Now about trying some specific questions? Don't tell me to talk to personnel from Cooper, they haven't the slightest conception of the dangers of radiation, they say "radiation is not accumulative" - "infinite amount of radiation" - "the stack is a monitoring device" - "we expect NO radiation from the stack". The men who built the stack were told it was an air pressure release valve. The stack was completely omitted from the artist's conception of Cooper. Need I go on? This does not build confidence.

A reasonable and sensible answer should be given to either accept or refute the "Public Health Evaluation of the Cooper Station" April, '68 - which states 500mrem/yr to the thyroid of a 1 yr child who ingests milk within a 15-20 mile radius of Cooper. Cooper operates on the level of Brecken 1 - and who says that Cooper will operate on this level? I know several well educated men who have left Cooper in disgust because of the

confusion that goes on there. They say Cooper is a mess. Would you comment on this evaluation, and the man who wrote it, please, and also what has happened to our Public Health in the area of nuclear monitoring?

Isn't there a dissemination factor involved here - say 2, 2½? If Cooper's impact can be felt 20 miles away in milk, where does that leave us? Also please comment on the reliability of air monitoring, when this uptake in cattle was not found in the air, but in cattle.

Who interprets the monitoring? The men who make their living at the Atomic Plant? This is a new science, where are all these nuclear physicists, who should constantly check these atom plants going to come from?

Another specific question, Humboldt Bay. Radiation level at the boundary line - 155 - 200 mrem/yr. Why do you allow Humboldt Bay to continue to operate? This radiation level must come from air monitoring, this is only one pathway of radiation, this couldn't possibly tell the accumulative dosage of all pathways - which is the real dosage. Where are your estimated releases here of mrem/yr? Where is your stringent control? According to a story in the Wall Street Journal, there was a plan to check rabbits who ate only grass in the area of Humboldt Bay, these rabbits were fed boughten food. Where is your discipline, this could happen here with the attitude of the men at Cooper, they are only interested in their paycheck.

Now to my real question, in "Surveillance Studies around a Boiling Water Reactor Plant", the Public Health said "it would be desirable to have a radionuclide analyses made of beef cattle this is a direct recommendation that these studies be made. Where are they? They actually did find an uptake of ^{131}I in dairy cattle and an uptake of ^{137}Cs in corn kernels. This really puts us in a spot.

You mentioned that in a dozen or so existing plants - a dozen? My last count was 6 with operating records, 2 just beginning, and 4 terminated - (terminated? buried?) From the Public Health, leakage figures on 4, 5%, 15%, 15%, and 25%. That does not make for confidence. Cooper will be many times larger than any existing D&W plant with records, and Cooper is being built by a bunch of amateurs.

In a dozen or so existing plants there has never been an incident where marketing of food has been affected doesn't mean much to me. Have these foods been adequately tested? I have a feeling that the AEC will avoid this situation at all costs. I know that tests have not been made on beef cattle, because I don't think there are any beef cattle in the vicinity of existing D&W plants. How about disproving me?

And I am sure that you people at the AEC - the EPA - and the H are all awaiting breathlessly to make our farm and my children a living laboratory - with whose body counts of my children or what a wonderful opportunity, just think, you won't even have to buy your own guinea pigs.

In the Calvert Cliffs' decision by the Federal courts of Appeal in the District of Columbia, it was stated that it was mandated that the full environmental impact upon the environment be made prior to operation of these atomic plants. In this area this is cattle and corn, not fish.

Your refusal to answer my specific questions will be taken into consideration, either you cannot, or you are disenfranchizing me of my rights as a citizen of the United States.

We have been placed in the middle of Goldman and Tamplin and the AEC, either way we lose. Mr. Rogers, we haven't a prayer.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jeff Broedy
Mrs. Jeff Broedy

KEI

Cooper
Dresden
Humboldt Bay

DEC 22 1971

30-298

Mrs. Jeff Broady
Ironville, Nebraska 68321

Dear Mrs. Broady:

Docket
No?
PDR?

In response to your letter to Chairman Schickinger we understand your concern regarding the possible impact of the operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station on your feed grain and on your cattle. I want to assure you that the AEC's standards and regulations governing the plant's design and operation are sufficiently stringent that Cooper Station will not jeopardize the health of children or adults in your area. The license is required by the AEC to carry out both an effluent and environmental monitoring program to ensure that the small quantities of radioactivity released from the plant comply with all AEC regulations and license conditions. The levels of exposure from such small quantities are well within the standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency. We have a well-organized and comprehensive compliance program and staff to ensure that the operator of the plant does indeed carry out the surveillance required and that the radiological environmental impact on such foods as grain, meat, and milk is negligible.

In our experience with the dozen or more similar plants in operation to date, there has never been an incident where the marketing of local foods has in any way been affected.

Yours sincerely,

LESTER ROGERS

Lester Rogers, Director
Division of Radiological and
Environmental Protection

50-298

Distribution:
P. Morris, DRL
H. K. Shapar, OGC
L. Kornblith, CO
DR-3963

PDR

REP:TAB REP:ADRF CO REP:DIR

JKustner:segCGaertsfelder LKornblith LRogers

12/17/71 12/ /71 12/ /71 12/ /71

9102120279