



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

July 6, 1981

Dr. Nunzio Palladino, Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555



Re: Three Mile Island

Dear Sir:

I, as many others, oppose the re-start of TMI 1 and 2 after experiencing the disastrous accident at TMI 2.

It is evident that Met. Ed. and GPU do not have the technical knowledge to operate a nuclear power plant, therefore they should not be permitted to re-start TMI 1 and be compelled to safely and completely clean-up TMI 2 without cost to the ratepayer.

I feel we are being used in experimentation for the nuclear industry for this devastating, hazardous and expensive source of energy.

It is intolerable to be forced to live in this perilous environment; lack of knowledge, excuses, misleading reports and hind-sight are unacceptable.

In the event of a temporary or permanent evacuation, I am imperatively requesting "Full Coverage Insurance" on property, possessions and health, as releases of radiation cannot be compared to other disasters. I consider our evacuation plans inadequate.

I will hold responsible any person or persons authorizing the re-start of these two nuclear power plants.

I hope you will take the necessary action to prohibit resuming of operation.

Wishing you the best in your new appointment, I am

Respectfully,

Clarice H. Parsons

(Mrs.) Clarice H. Parsons
899 Clearmount Road
York, Pennsylvania 17403

DS03
S
1/0

Mr. Nunzio Palladino
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555



July 2, 1981

Chairman Palladino:

Although you have the opportunity to improve the image of the NRC as a true regulator (rather than promoter) of the commercial nuclear power industry in the TMI-1 restart decision, few observers expect you to be anything other than the traditional rubber stamp for the industry which previous NRC (and AEC) chairmen have been. I admit that I am among the doubters, but I feel constrained to write nonetheless.

If Utility X requested permission from the NRC to build a new nuclear power plant in the midst of an existing high level nuclear waste repository, you would probably doubt the competence of that Utility's executives. If, in addition, the same Utility had a reputation for poor management among its peers in the industry, the absurdity of the request would be magnified. But if the petitioning Utility also happened to be uniquely cursed by having nursed a minor malfunction into the most serious commercial nuclear accident in the "Western world," you would probably consider the request a practical joke. The only difference between the above hypothetical case and that of Metropolitan Edison's request to restart TMI-1 is that the reactor in question is already built. This difference, however, only reduces the absurdity if one assumes that the Utility's sunken costs are more valuable than area residents' health and safety.

The NRC is obviously preparing to allow Met Ed to return TMI-1 to full service on an Island which has become a high level nuclear waste dump as a result of the same Utility's TMI-2 accident. After the NRC's own post-accident survey showed area residents overwhelmingly opposed to the TMI nuclear facility, the Agency seems to have decided on a two phased approach to this political problem. First, the NRC tried to "educate" (critics would prefer the term "propagandize") area residents regarding the alleged benefits of commercial nuclear power. As it became more obvious that public sentiment against the restart was remaining firm, the NRC used its influence to exclude local citizens from having any voice in the decision. Your Agency opposed funding for citizen intervenors (despite the recommendation by some NRC staff that such support was necessary) and thus severely limited area residents in presenting their case before the NRC's own Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in the face of the highly paid "experts" hired by the Utility.

Instead of allowing TMI-1 to be rushed back on line as the nuclear industry is demanding, why not exert your influence in modifying -- or, better, abolishing -- the Price-Anderson Act which limits every utility's liability and thus reduces safety incentives? This single piece of legislation (which stands as a loud contradiction of the nuclear industry's safety assurances) makes accidents more likely and cannot be justified by any reasonable argument (even pro-nuclear advocates admit this).

Many observers consider you to be a nuclear industry mouthpiece because of your previous employment in the Westinghouse nuclear program and your academic position as head of Penn State's Department of Nuclear Engineering. You have insisted, however, that public safety is one of your key concerns. If you know something the rest of the world does not about why it is really quite safe to operate a nuclear reactor in the midst of a high level waste dump, make that information public immediately. If not, have the courage to vote against any TMI-1 restart. Such a courageous vote by you would also help establish more credibility for the NRC as an evenhanded regulator.

Edward Walsh / 720 S. Allen St. / State College, Pa. 16801

DS03
1/0
Edward Walsh