

DEAR SIR

FROM ANGEL... ..


I think nuclear power should be shut down and never come back on.

I think there should be a law about NO NUCLEAR POWER ALLOWED.

I think nuclear power stinks. Who ever thought of this is stupid. You are so stupid you just love NUCLEAR POWER!!!!!!

And half the nation hates nuclear Power !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Angel Hacker, 802 Bridge St. New Cumberland.
PA. 17020
Address



DS03
S
11

56-289

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D.C.

March 9, 1981

Mr. Carlton Kannerer
Direct, Off. of Congressional Affairs
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555
Sir:

The attached communication
is sent for your consideration.
Please investigate the statements
contained therein and forward me
the necessary information for re-
ply, returning the enclosed corre-
spondence with your answer.

Yours truly,

Allen E. Ertel
Allen E. Ertel, M. C.

1211 Longworth HOB
Washington, D.C. 20515
ATTN: Bob



CONGRESSMAN ALLEN E. EITEL

PLEASE RETURN TO:

☐ Harrisburg Post Mall
 Harrisburg, Pa. 17111
 Phone: 326-6000

☐ Mobile Office
 c/o Box 488
 Federal Building
 Williamsport, Pa. 17701
 Phone: 326-2814

☐ 240 West Third Street
 Federal Building
 Box 488
 Williamsport, Pa. 17701
 Phone: 326-2814

(PLEASE PRINT OR SIGNET BELOW)


DATE: 3-6-81 Taken by: ly
 NAME: Wes Patterson Manfred
 ADDRESS: 2901 Rumson Dr
 TELEPHONE NUMBER: Lansburg PA 17104
 SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER(S): 23295891
 VETERAN'S "G" NO. _____



NATURE OF PROBLEM: He was upset about the
NRC "limited appearance" meeting. He
didn't get to speak last night
and ~~was~~ is afraid & concerned
there will not be another meeting in
which to express his viewpoint to
the NRC Licensing Board

I hereby authorize Congressman Allen E. Eitel or his representative to act on my behalf and
 have access to any records pertaining to this matter.

(Signed) _____



DOCKET NUMBER 50-289
PROD. & UTIL. FAC.

Carolyn Potts
31 West Simpson St.
Methuen, Mass. 01754

TMI Hearing - March 2, 1981 - Written Statement

To Members of the Atomic Safety
and Licensing Board:

These comments express my extreme
opposition to the Unit 1 restart at
Three Mile Island. Actually, I support
a moratorium on all nuclear power
installation construction and licensing --
particularly in population dense areas.

My husband and I own both a home and
an investment property in this area. We
have been hard working, and we have
been careful in spending. That is how
we came to own two properties in our
thirties. Our early energy conserving
efforts were undertaken for our own
pocketbooks, seeking to decrease our fuel
and electric use (waste) and, thus, our costs.
Now we have an even greater interest
in limiting our energy use. We don't
want to be any part of an excuse to
promote nuclear energy -- especially the
restart of TMI's reactors. In fact, I
would favor enforced conservation to

reduce the glutinous waste of energy observable all around us. The way I see it -- we, the consumers, are the camel's back; the utilities combined with our excessive energy use are our burden; and the accident at Three Mile Island is the straw, the back-breaking, final straw.

My family has been here in Central Pennsylvania through many generations. Rural people mostly, lovers of the land. I never again want us to be terrorized by a report of the T.M.I. accident. The loss of one beloved person is grief --, yet it is part of life's experience. But the loss of security of all ties, of lifelong investments in property through the dispersal of family and friends, on the ruin from technology gone haywire, is heartache beyond speaking. It is part of life's experience only if we allow it to become so.

The benefits of the restart of T.M.I. Unit 1 are not worth the risks to this area's population and environment. It would be tragic enough for an accident or chronic leakages to contaminate the fields and hills and streams of any area.

MOX-ED's installation, however puts several hundred thousand people in jeopardy of being uprooted and losing everything, not even considering health risks. Even the "potential" for another accident is enough to endanger our peace of mind, which is mighty ~~hard~~ hard to come by these days anyway.

I am sickened when I hear long-sounding sirens. And it's not fire that comes to mind. It's another "incident" at TMI.

Because TMI is part of the whole, I want to make some comments that apply to nuclear power, in general, as well as TMI in particular. I believe the touted low cost of nuclear power is a fraud, due to 1/ government subsidy and 2/ inadequate expenditure on safety, siting, and accident coverage. This nation is not prepared for the use of nuclear power as a major resource. Critical problems include a shortage of trained technologists, waste disposal questions, and extremely inadequate planning and compensation for accident victims.

Our next home will be small and a passive solar construction. Interest in such construction is definitely on the rise. People neither want to pay for nuclear power nor contribute to its expenses.

We want to remain in this area, but plan to build at least 20 miles west of TME, should the Nuclear Regulatory Commission fail us and allow TME to be reactivated.

No one, they say, has lost yet from nuclear power. That may or may not be. For myself and many I know, we surely aren't living as well since the accident. Or should I say, with the same sense of well-being. We did have our eyes opened, and that is good. But a sense of well-being one enjoys by living in a certain area is hard to put a price on and to figure into cost/benefit analysis. Believe me, though, we felt its loss.

Please do not allow the reactors to go back on line.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Potts

Citizen comment on the proposed re-starting of TMI Unit 1

From: Timothy W. Potts
31 W. Simpson Street
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055



I have two comments to make. One concerns public policy; the other TMI.

First, I contend that all federal research and development projects for nuclear technology should cease. President Reagan asserts that the private sector is the proper place for the development of solar and other alternate energy sources, and has proposed to cut the use of federal funds for that purpose.

I agree with him, and believe his philosophy should apply to nuclear energy as well as solar. If nuclear energy is such a great idea, let the utilities fund their own research and development. Helping utilities to terrorize communities is not a legitimate use of tax dollars, in my opinion.

The federal government's only role should be to police the nuclear industry to ensure public safety. And it should do a much better police job in the future than it has in the past.

As for Three Mile Island, I inalterably oppose returning Unit 1 to service. I have no confidence in Metropolitan Edison's competence to operate TMI safely. But even more to the point, I have no faith in nuclear technology. I do not believe it is necessary, and I do not believe that it is safe enough to be part of our community.

I do believe that sooner or later some town of people like us will pay a very high price for the Faustian bargain of nuclear power. But I have paid a high enough price -- both monetarily and emotionally -- and I do not intend to pay any more than it takes to eliminate TMI from my life.

Especially, I intend to reclaim that peace of mind which is my right. When I think of the terror I and my family endured two years ago, of the flight from our home and the restless nights, of the deceit practiced by virtually everyone in authority, of the frightening question that intrudes every time we hear a siren, then I think again that we have had enough.

You, of course, have a vested interest in promoting nuclear energy and, therefore, in opening TMI for business again. Unfortunately, you also have the authority to do that. You can ignore what I want. You can walk away from the abiding harm that TMI has caused our community. You can refuse to admit my determination not to have TMI operate again.

But if you do, at least show enough responsibility to make certain that we are prepared the next time someone from Metropolitan Edison decides that federal regulations are too inconvenient for compliance. Make sure that when it happens again you can evacuate people with mind and body intact. And I don't mean to make sure on paper. Make sure by doing it. Conduct a full evacuation of the Harrisburg area to test your plans. Then revise your plans and do it again until you get it right. And then, just maybe, you should consider what to do with TMI.

Until then, I want my message to be clear. I want to be secure in my home. I want to choose the risks that I will live with.

I want TMI shut down forever as a nuclear power plant.



DOCKET NUMBER 50-289
PROD. & UTIL. FAC.

200 Gettysburg Pike
Mechanicsburg, Pa. 17055
March 5, 1981

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Dear Sirs:

You have been hearing only legalities. I hope you will consider some common sense arguments as well when deciding whether or not to restart TMI-1.

We don't need it. Even the NRC staff admits we have enough electricity to cover our needs for the next two years. And consumption is going down.

Every time MetEd is allowed to release gas or water to our environment, they tell us not to worry-it is really nothing-compared to what an operating plant discharges. We don't like what they call nothing. We certainly don't want what they call significant releases-those connected with an operating plant.

We have already had an undetermined amount of radioactivity. We have a possibility of a lot more before cleanup of Unit 2 is done. No-one can even estimate how much more we will get. And now someone wants to give us another dose deliberately? How could anyone even consider such a thing?

The waste from Unit-2 has created a nuclear waste dump-some high level and some low level. Isn't that enough for one community? And all this waste can leak-and has been leaking. It is too much to live with and it's certainly is unsafe to have anyone working beside it in another plant. NRC protests that a flood-prone island is no place to put waste. Neither should it be a place to create any more.

You cannot now remove high level waste from that island. By July you may have only one place in the whole country where you can take the low level waste. Why would anyone create more that we cannot remove?

Running a nuclear plant is dependent upon having a company which is meticulous in its attention to safety. So far MetEd in the past two years since the accident (we won't even talk about before the accident) has accidentally dumped water twice, has had to release it into unit 1 once, has spilled sulphuric acid, has neglected to properly screen employees, has not searched employees thoroughly, has had a control room protected by a looped rope, and has been cited several times by the NRC because it did not properly package waste to be shipped out. That sounds sloppy to me-something we can't afford in nuclear management.

Because of their finances, there is serious question that MetEd can clean up Unit 2. On the brink of bankruptcy how can they hire the hundreds of workers needed to run another plant? How can they put in the safety systems needed for protection? Or do the maintenance and surveillance necessary to protect public and worker health?

Since the accident we have never had a successful civil defense exercise. They botched each one they tried. Furthermore civil defense plans have been kept secret by most local governments and by state government. How can citizens be prepared when nothing has been published in two years? No state worker in Harrisburg has ever been told what to do in an emergency and there has never been a drill of any kind. Hospitals, prisons, schools-none are prepared.

Many emergency plans call for things like having DER take radiation readings in the area. DER has added a couple public relations people since the accident but no engineers and very little equipment.

These are not emotional arguments. These do not just claim stress. They are common sense. I hope there is a place in your deliberation for asking questions about ordinary events and plans as well as scientific and legal sophistries.

Yours truly,

Mr. Stanley Davis

Dear Sirs:

I think that Three Mile
Island Unit I Nuclear Generating
Station should not be allowed
to be restarted.

The management of T.M.I.
has proven they can run it
properly. Also they tried to
cover up the seriousness of the
situation.



Thank You
R.M. CURRIER
8 HOLLOW RD
TELFORD PA 18969

To: NRC

March 5, 1981

Please, for the sake of
our health and peace of mind,
do not reopen Unit I of
TMI at this time. There is
still too much unfinished
business going on with Unit 2!


Mary Dinga
120 Greenwood Ave, Middletown, PA



March 4, 1981

TO: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
FROM: Mrs. Ruth Blaker, 412 Eshleman St., Highspire, PA 17034
SUBJECT: Restart of Unit I at TMI

I am against the restart of Unit I at Three Mile Island.



March 4, 1981

TO: NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
FROM: Mrs. Mary Smith, 417 Eshleman St., Highspire, PA 17034
SUBJECT: Restart of Unit I at TMI

I am opposed to the restart of Unit I at Three Mile Island.

DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-989


We oppose the re-opening
of TMI's Unit I.

Mr. & Mrs. Kenneth E. Haas, Jr.

117 Greenwood Dr.

Middletown, Pa.

I am opposed to the re-opening of TMI Unit I.



Middletown, Pa.

MADE VIA TELEPHONE
31 HEATHERLY RD
MIDDLETOWN, PA 17057

DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL FAC. 50-289


KOSE KOUFOS
YORK SPGS PA 17372




U. S. Nuclear Reg. Comm.
Off. of Pub. Aff. Reg. 1
631 Park Dr.
King of Prussia, Pa. 19406

USPS 1978

I will not be able to attend the retreat being
on Mar. 5, nor would like to submit my statement.
I & my family are totally against the siting of
THI Unit 1 for numerous reasons, including;
Unit 1 has barely started to be dismantled;
Unit 1 has, to me, proven it is unfit to handle
a nuclear generating facility; nuclear power has
too much of a potential for catastrophe. We
would like to see THI closed up safely & shut
down for good or turned into a coal generating
plant, thereby saving one of this country's most precious
resources. Sincerely,
Mr. & Mrs. Peter Kasper & Fam.





DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 51-289

NRC

March 5, 1981

Licensing & Safety
Committee

To Whom It May Concern:

As a Resident of 12 Burd Rd. in Middletown, Pa. I have very grave concerns about the Restart of Unit I at Three Mile Island.

I do not feel that it's reasonable to operate a nuclear generating plant at the same site and at the same time that a crippled Reactor is down.

Since the March 1979 accident with Unit II much controversy has arisen over operating & safety procedures with nuclear power plants. These have not been resolved as yet and it's

ridiculous to assume that there won't be additional problems with Unit II.

To Restart Unit I would put

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1985
JAN 10 1985
JAN 10 1985



additional burdens on the staff at
the plant and adds to the risk of Unit
I developing problems as it operates.
Personally, I feel nuclear power
just can't "go away" as we are a
country that uses much energy. However,
there has to be more safeguards
imposed and the industry should be made
to go slower. One can't expect a
company, who exists to turn a profit,
to adequately police itself. This is best
handled by the government. ^{Also} I believe
a military presence on the island
to ensure security is the only reasonable
answer to policing against outsiders,
such as terrorist groups.
As for operating safety, the Met-
Ed Co. has bungled much in the past
months and left area residents feeling
very insecure. An accident like TMI
2 has never occurred before and
there's still too much to learn in

- 2 -

regards to correcting the damage done to enable the same company to operate Unit I while still dealing with the problems of Unit II is a terrible injustice to area residents who already feel the stress from lack of confidence in the nuclear industry.

Healthwise, I'm concerning myself with thoughts of more radioactive releases both planned & unplanned. Now, GPR wants to add "normal background" radiation from the plant by operating UNIT I. This is upsetting to me & I feel that it does have a health effect on the public. We don't as yet know the long term effects of low-level radiation. We are actually the human guinea-pigs who will be statistics sometime, either for better or worse.

Please consider the views of the people living next door to this power

plant. This is our home and we want to feel as secure living here as we have a right to feel.

Please don't think only of \$ and ¢ in relation to this issue. The nuclear issue is still very controversial and your decision will affect the entire Nation. You must include considerations of the general public in all you do because we are always going to be directly affected, both economically and health-wise.

Thank you.

God help you in your endeavors.

Most Sincerely

Susan E. Lawruk


Susan E. Lawruk

12 Burd Rd.

Middletown, Pa 17057

March 2, 1981

Ivan W. Smith, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
25 North Court Street
Harrisburg, Penna. 17101



Dear Chairman Smith,

We are taking this time to submit our written statement in regards to the T.M.I. Unit 1 Restart Hearings.

We attended the last public meeting, held by the N.R.C. at the Middletown Liberty Fire Hall. That was nothing more than an exhibition of unruly, unmannerly people and was not our idea of how a public meeting should proceed. We do not care to watch this type of people perform any more.

However, we still feel that it is important to express our opinion in a civilized manner, without the guise of hysteria.

Carl had the extreme fortune of being chosen to be one of the D.E.R. community monitors, and had taken the 50-hour training course. The more we learned about nuclear power, the more viable an energy source we think it is.

We feel enough hearings have been
held on the subject of C.M.I. Unit #1
Restart. You could hold 1,000 meetings
and some elements of our community
would still always be dis-satisfied.

We would encourage the restart
of Unit #1 at C.M.I. without further
delay and we appreciate this opportunity
to submit our written statement to you.

I'm sure you'll weigh all the facts
and hopefully, you'll agree with our
judgement on the C.M.I. Unit #1 Restart.

We hope this written statement,
drafted with a rational view of reality,
will carry as much weight with the
Board, as the rude people who show
their dis-respect every chance they get.

Sincerely
Earl A. Peters
Vicki L. Peters

361 E. Roosevelt Ave.
Middletown, Penna. 17057




MRS VICKI L. PETE
361 E. ROOSEVELT
MIDDLETOWN PA 17057

DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-289.....

T May St
Htft, Ct. 06105
T Mon 2, 1981.

Subject: Docket 50-28951
TMI Unit 1
Trenton, Pa.

Mr John F. Kearney
Chairman/Commissioner
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555



Dear Mr. Kearney,

Since TMI Unit 1 was not damaged as a result of the accident to TMI-2, and since other power plants are permitted to make modifications while operating, what reason is there to refuse permission to restart TMI-1?

It seems to me that your refusal to allow TMI-1 to return to service plays directly into the hands of anti-nuclear zealots who see this refusal as proof of the overwhelming danger of nuclear power. Returning this plant to service, would, on the other hand, provide clear proof (if more be needed) of the value

and safety of obtaining electricity
from nuclear power rather than
relying on OPEC oil.

I am sure there will be loud
outcries from the enemies of nuclear
power as soon as you announce the
re-opening of TH1-1, but this problem
will be picayune compared to the
difficulty you and all of us Americans,
especially those of us who live in the
Hartland, will face should there
be a cut-off, or even a reduction in
the supply of oil.


I urge you to permit TH1-1 to
do the work it was built to do -

Francis Barker

10-1-8
2015-28


833 North Waterloo
Los Angeles, CA 90026
March 12, 1981

John F. Ahearne
Chair
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H St. NW
Washington, DC 20355



Dear Mr. Ahearne:

I strongly urge that 3 Mile Island not be reopened. For reasons that are well known to most people, nuclear power represents a tremendous threat to the health and wellbeing of its neighbors, and alternate sources of energy must be developed NOW.


Beatrice R. Miller

BOOKLET NUMBER
50-289

480 Valerie Dr.
Vista, California 92083
March 11, 1981

Mr. John Ahearne, Chairman
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Sir:

Even though I am a stockholder in General Public Utilities, owner of Three Mile Island, I urge you not to permit the opening of Unit 1. I am in total sympathy with the residents of the area fighting the opening and have so expressed myself to GPU, stating a preference for bankruptcy. As a matter of fact I would urge the NRC to phase out all nuclear plants across the country. I am willing to make any sacrifice that my children and grandchildren do not have to live with this ever-present lethal and crippling danger.

When I bought my stock I had never heard of nuclear plants. It has gone from plant to plant as plants have failed until it ended up in nuclear energy.

Respectfully yours,

Willard Steward
Mrs. Willard Steward

an
Commission

RECEIVED
MAR 12 1981
NRC

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

March 13, 1981

Dear Mr. Ahearne,

I am writing you in regard to my grave concern over the functioning of the Three Mile Island nuclear facility.

Its record clearly indicates a long standing history of difficulties - some of very major consequence. There is a great deal of public controversy and discussion over the potential benefits and dangers of nuclear power systems, as you well know. It would seem then to behoove the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to move with utmost caution in sanctioning continued operation of such plants as T.M.I. considering prior complications.

I would urge you NOT TO RETURN IT TO SERVICE, as the hazards here far outweigh the value in its operation.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

Maria Manetta

11550 Nebraska Ave
LA CA 90025


LOGSHEET
PROD. & C. 50-289



[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly a letter or memorandum.]

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly a letter or memorandum.]

PIONEER



C. Fusco
862 E. 17th St
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11230

Clearwater, Florida

February 6, 1981

Mr. James F. Ahearne
Chairman
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H. Street, N. W.
Washington, DC 20555

DOCKET 50-289SP
TMI UNIT 1
MIDDLINGTON, PA.

Preventing operation of the undamaged TMI Unit 1 is very shortsighted and unnecessary. The unit has been modified and needs to be started at once. The delay is overly long and the absence of this unit from its system generating ability is costing the Metropolitan Edison and its customers as much \$500,000 daily.

Nuclear power is safe, inexpensive and badly needed, especially in the fossil fuel deficient N. E. areas of the nation. The NRC is hereby urged to get TMI Unit 1 on the line at once.

Alan D. Southworth
Alan D. Southworth
1658 Lake Ave. Apt. 2
Clearwater, FL 335 16

Copies to:
Ms. Lori Dubiel
President
Friends and Family of TMI
P. O. Box 82
Highspire, PA 170 34

Senator Paula Hawkins
Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Congressman C. W. Young
2453 Rayburn Office Building
Washington, DC 20515



50-289

Students for Alternatives to
Nuclear Energy
c/o [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible], Ca.
[illegible]

P.O. Box

Mr. John Anagnostis, Chairman N.R.C.
1215 N. St.
Washington D.C.
20541

Dear Mr. Anagnostis,

We have been informed of the decision making process the N.R.C. is currently engaging in concerning the restarting of the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant Unit 1. We are terribly distressed and disappointed that the N.R.C., our only hope for preventing these technological monstrosities from further endangering human welfare, would even consider relicensing part of a nuclear power plant whose system fell below even the most minimal standards set today.

We urge you, and all N.R.C. officials and staff, to reconsider the negative implications of the Three Mile Island accident. But most importantly, we ask that you refuse to allow the Three Mile Island nuclear plant to be restarted. The damage done to the country and more specifically to the residents of the Harrisburg vicinity cannot be calculated. The N.R.C., for this reason, must not take the risk of relicensing a plant already known for failure.

Thankyou,

Gale C. Bonetto
Catherine J. Boner
Gisianne E. Mason

Students for Alternatives to
Nuclear Energy

END



10/23/58 299

Dear Mr. [unclear],

Please advise to James Kephart's letter regarding the Bailey Plant. We don't need that plant, it's too dangerous!! Please don't renew this permit. You've been too sluggish in your response to the problems of nuclear power. Please act with the authority you have. You can make this country a safe place to live.

L. Camporella
2505 S. 57th Ave.
Cicero, Ill. 60648

Sincerely,
L. Camporella

100-105000-100
100-105000-100

100-105000-100

100-105000-100

100-105000-100

100-105000-100

in the United States
and then United States
in order to request your assistance
in the matter of the United States
government that there must be
a complete review of the United States
and we need to provide the needed
information. Every day we delay
state, the 100 into the Department
of Agriculture. There are approximately
150,000. The United States is not yet
in the position. However, we have
we delay we lose a large amount of
foreign oil. The country can not




March 10, 1981

Dear Chairman, Council,

I strongly urge you not
to allow the start-up
of Three Mile Island
Unit 1 until all
proceedings regarding
that reactor have been
completed and the
decision reversed.

Thank you,
Gaye Fleming
1930 Matthe Rd.
Shore Beach,
CA 93449



58-289

LOUIS B. FREEMAN
586 CAVAN DRIVE
PITTSBURGH, PENNA. 15206

March 10, 1958

Mr. John F. O'Shea, Chairman
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington D.C., 20555



Dear Mr. O'Shea:

The purpose of this letter is to urge you to get the workable Three Mile Island I plant back on line. It is my understanding that the Calvesh and Wilson reactors of similar design are working fine. Surely TMI-I has been modified enough to make it as good as the operating reactors by now. With the utility on its financial back, and the U. S. Government going to have to pick up the bill, we need TMI-I operating.

Very Truly yours,
Louis B. Freeman

50:284

Dear Mr. Ahearne

Please do what you can to prevent
the re opening of Three Mile Island,
we are just beginning to realize
the extent to which the entire earth
is being irreversibly polluted by the
irresponsibility of those business men who
are profiting now at the ~~expense~~ ^{events} which
can destroy future generations.


Please help-

Best regards

Fern Palmer

Fern Palmer
7716 Westman Ave.
Whittier, Calif. 90606

Salt Lake Temple USA 10c



HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Chairman John F. Ahearne
1717 "H" Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20301

POSTAL REGISTER
50 289
STOP & UTIL. REG.

Gail M. Crow
80 South Queen St.
York, PA. 17403

Dean Shanahan, Chairman
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 1165
Harrisburg, PA. 17120

Dear Mr. Shanahan,

It has come to my attention that serious consideration is being given to restarting TMI-1. I honestly cannot understand how anyone can consider operating unit-1 beside contaminated unit-2. It seems obvious to me that neither Met. Ed. nor GEP nor the NRC has had the time nor the energy to properly address TMI-2 clean-up. Now, then, can we seriously consider carrying on both the clean-up (unit-2) and operation (unit-1) at the same time?

My family and friends experienced the TMI-2 incident with great anxiety, and we retain a paranoia regarding nuclear production of energy. This paranoia extends beyond the mere fear of another accident if unit-1 is restarted. We watch carefully and constantly fear similar incidents at the Peach Bottom plant. But even further, we question the powers that be, who we assessed were examining new proposals for energy production. Many of us had faith in our government to test and reject plans to build and operate such facilities with our safety in mind. We never imagined that the regulatory and licensing bodies would allow such a potential danger to exist in our midst without strict overseeing the initial defense with evacuation plans and then monitoring safety procedures closely and repeatedly, throughout the unit's operation. Well, we have come to learn that our safety does not seem to be as important as the utility's profit or the satisfaction of this nation's gluttonous desire for energy.

I noticed a statement at the bottom of my electric bill "informing" me that the cost of my electric would not be so high if TMI-1 were operating. I think that is a low blow from Met. Ed. to even imply that the TMI-1 restart issue is just that simple - after all they've put us through.

I do not agree with restarting TMI-1 now. I hesitate to say that I would ever agree with TMI-1's restart given the fears I still have. However, I implore you to at least consider revising the area evacuation plans and completely cleaning up TMI-2 before even considering putting any unit on that island on line.

Your serious consideration of my serious opinion is truly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gail M. Crow