

M. Wagner

April 23, 1985

Note to: Owen Thompson

From: Mary Wagner

SUBJECT: TMI-1: AAMODT APRIL 13 PLEADING

To assist you in obtaining the input we will need to answer the above pleading, I have jotted down the areas where I see a need for the Staff to supply me with a reply. Are the points raised by the Aamodts significant? If not, why not? If so, what should we do about them?

Sec. 3.1

- pp. 6-9 Neonatal hypothyroidism
- p. 9 Allegation of NRC staff's withholding of a study

Sec. 3.2, 3.21

- pp. 9-12 Reports of health effects beyond 10 mile EPZ
- p. 9 fn* NRC personnel participation in GPU's briefing of TMI-area physicians

Sec. 4.0

- pp. 13-14 Allegations of inadequate measurements by agencies
- p. 13 EPA joint report of Feb. 25, 1985 - "NRC director had indicated" - who is this? What did he say - do we have any explanation of nature of revisions (e.g., were they really revising the data?)

- pp. 13-14 Allegations of health effects from being outside

- p. 14 Stimulation of vegetation by radiation

- p. 15 Alleged failure to test for I¹²⁹

- p. 15 Quoted statements in EPA report

- p. 16 Radioactivity in soil/tree damage

8509050093 850718
PDR FOIA
KUCHENB85-428 PDR

A/7

Sec. 5.0

pp. 16-18 Significance of 5100 degree temperature of the core -
transuranics

This list may not be complete; please review the Aamodt pleading yourself to
see whether there are additional areas where Staff input will be needed.

cc: Frank Congel
Falk Kantor

May