



# AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

919 EIGHTEENTH STREET NW WASHINGTON 6 DC

PHONE: MEtropolitan 8-4215

June 13, 1961

## OFFICERS

Ivan L. Bateman, President  
John P. Gallagher, First Vice President  
J. Dillon Kennedy, Second Vice President  
C. E. Frey, Treasurer  
Northcott Ely, General Counsel  
Alex Radin, General Manager

## DIRECTORS

S. G. ADKINS  
Superintendent, Electric Department  
Doerfler, Virginia  
IVAN L. BATEMAN  
Chief Electrical Engineer and Assistant Manager  
Department of Water and Power  
Los Angeles, California  
HOWARD A. BERRY  
General Superintendent, Water and Electric Plant  
Carthage, Missouri

CARL F. BUFE  
Superintendent, Dept. of Municipal Service  
Wyandotte, Michigan

M. I. BURNIN  
Director of Public Utilities  
Bloomington, Illinois

V. M. CLEVELAND  
Manager, PUD No. 1 of Clark County  
Yacouver, Washington

JACK B. CRISWELL  
Superintendent, Springfield Utility  
Springfield, Oregon

DEWEY J. DABOEE  
Executive Manager, Nebraska Public Power System  
Columbus, Nebraska

MIKE DOWD  
Executive Officer, Imperial Irrigation District  
El Centro, California

O. E. EDDENS  
Manager, Decatur Electric Dept.  
Decatur, Alabama

JOHN D. FERGUSON  
Superintendent, Department of Public Utilities  
Tacoma, Washington

S. B. FINLEY  
General Manager, Electric Power Board  
Chattanooga, Tennessee

JOHN P. GALLAGHER  
Director of Utilities  
Piqua, Ohio

J. DILLON KENNEDY  
Commissioner  
Department of Electric and Water Utilities  
Jacksonville, Florida

FRANCIS H. KING  
Manager, Gas and Electric Dept.  
Weymouth, Massachusetts

N. B. MCHUGH  
General Manager, Municipal Power and Light  
Lubbock, Texas

R. J. McMULLIN  
General Manager, Salt River Project  
Phoenix, Arizona

J. RAY MORTON  
President, Light, Gas and Water Division  
Memphis, Tennessee

RAY NIXON  
Director, Department of Public Utilities  
Colorado Springs, Colorado

C. E. PRAY  
Manager of Collections and Accounts  
Board of Public Utilities  
Kansas City, Kansas

W. DAN SHUCKLER  
Manager, Crisp County Power Commission  
Cordale, Georgia

MERLE SMEDBERG  
Superintendent, Board of Public Utilities  
Jamaica, New York

RAFAEL URRUTIA  
Executive Director  
Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority  
San Juan, Puerto Rico

JOHN E. WALTERS  
General Manager, Borough Electric Works  
Wallingford, Connecticut

GLEN V. YANDER  
Manager, Spencer Municipal Utilities  
Spencer, Iowa

## AFFILIATES:

Arizona Municipal Power Users' Association  
California Municipal Utilities Assn.  
Central Service Assn.  
Colorado River Basin Consumers' Power, Inc.  
Colorado Rural Electric Assn.  
Florida Municipal Utilities Assn.  
Illinois Municipal Utilities Assn.  
Indiana Municipal Electric Assn.  
Iowa Assn. of Municipal Utilities  
Kansas Assn. of Municipal Utilities  
Kansas Electric Cooperatives, Inc.  
Massachusetts Municipal Electric Association  
Michigan Municipal Utilities Assn.  
Minnesota Electric Consumers Assn.  
Minnesota Municipal Utilities Assn.  
National Assn. of Municipal Utilities  
Municipal Electric Assn. of Massachusetts  
Nebraska Utilities Sec. League of Municipalities  
New Jersey Electric Utilities Assn. of N. Y. State  
Northwest Ohio Municipal Electric Assn.  
Northwest Ohio Municipal Electric Assn.  
Northwest Public Power Assn.  
Pennsylvania Municipal Utilities Assn.  
Saratoga Services, Inc.  
Tennessee Valley Public Power Assn.  
Texas Electric Cooperatives, Inc.  
Texas Municipal Utilities League  
Virginia Municipal Electric Power Association  
Washington Public Utility Districts' Assn.  
Wisconsin Municipal Utilities Assn.

The Secretary  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington 25, D. C.

Attention: Director, Division of Licensing and Regulation

Dear Sirs:

I should like to submit for your consideration our comments on the Commission's proposed Reactor Site Criteria Guides, on which comments were invited in your press release of February 10, 1961.

Our comments and suggestions are embodied in a statement made today by Mr. James L. Grahl of our staff before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and I should like to submit these same comments to the Commission in the form of the enclosed copy of Mr. Grahl's statement.

In addition, I would like to note that the Commission's efforts to develop industrial process steam reactors also appear to raise questions about the consistency of AEC's proposed guides on site criteria. As you know, it is not economically practical to transmit steam for long distances. In most cases, it is necessary that the industrial plants using process steam be located closely around the steam-producing plant. The Commission's distance-from-population criteria for reactors seem to us incompatible with the Commission's expenditures of time and money for the development of process steam reactors. This seeming incompatibility raises the question of whether the Commission intends to modify its reactor site criteria in order to enable process steam reactors to be used and, if so, what such modifications would mean in respect to future power reactor site criteria.

Your consideration of our comments will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Alex Radin

AR:ghz  
enc.

STATEMENT OF JAMES L. GRAHL, DIRECTOR OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY SERVICE  
OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.  
PRESENTED TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY  
JUNE 13, 1961

My name is James L. Grahl. I am Director of the Atomic Energy Service and Assistant General Manager of the American Public Power Association, which represents more than 1,000 local publicly owned electric utility systems in 43 States and Puerto Rico. Headquarters of the Association are at 919 Eighteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

On behalf of our Association, I want to express our appreciation for the Committee's invitation to present comments on the proposed reactor site criteria published by the Atomic Energy Commission on February 11, 1961.

We do have an interest in this matter and, without pretending to have an expert knowledge of this unusually complex problem, I will attempt to indicate some of the aspects of interest to local publicly owned electric systems.

Our membership is, of course, wholly in favor of whatever requirements are necessary for the public health and safety. A statement of general Association policy on atomic power adopted by our Board of Directors in 1956 stated that "the atomic power industry and related activities should be regulated with scrupulous care and impartiality to protect at all times the public health and safety". Consequently, we would support whatever site criteria are necessary to safeguard the public health and safety.

At the same time, the great majority of local public power agencies are municipally owned systems, and so the Association hopes that the site criteria for nuclear power plants will not make it economically impossible for large numbers of the municipal systems to utilize nuclear generating units when they are developed to the point of economic practicality.

There seems to be some conflict between these two positions. The Commission's proposed site criteria require nuclear power plants to be located some distance from the edge of a populated area, and for municipal power systems this distance requirement introduces costs and operating problems which in many cases would be prohibitive.

These distance requirements may well be necessary and prudent during the present developmental phase of power reactor technology. However, they should be recognized and established as criteria for this phase, and not regarded as necessarily establishing the pattern for nuclear power plant location for all time. Recognition of this fact might diminish considerably the concern with which many view the current and proposed requirements for locating reactors some distance from large or concentrated populations.

From our standpoint it would be most unfortunate if the proposed site criteria led to a conclusion at this time that nuclear power plants will always be impractical for those many municipal systems which cannot afford to locate their generating units a long distance from the edge of the city. We would hope that by the time economic plants have been developed, the technology would have advanced sufficiently to allow some easing of the distance criteria.

We recommend, therefore, that the AEC site criteria guides state explicitly that the criteria are those necessary or desirable during this developmental period -- that AEC will continue efforts to develop plants which are inherently safe enough so that at some future time distance from population may be less important -- and that the criteria therefore are subject to change in the future as the technology evolves and as further experience is gained in the design, construction and operation of nuclear reactors.

My second point is concerned with what seem to be some basic inconsistencies in the Commission's applications of distance requirements to nuclear reactor installations.

The Commission's policy on the proximity of reactors to population is defined in more detail in the proposed criteria than any other single factor. The criteria define with some care the requirements for a "low population zone" around a reactor and a "population center distance" from a reactor, yet it is my understanding that the Commission provisions for enforcing these requirements once an operating license has been issued are incomplete, at best.

To my knowledge, there is no definite requirement by the Commission which would prevent an industrial park or suburban housing development from springing up around a reactor, once it was licensed, and effectively abolishing the "low population zone" so carefully calculated as a requirement for issuing the license. Similarly, I understand that there is no Commission requirement which would prevent a center of population from expanding outward and decreasing or wiping out the minimum distance to the boundary of the nearest city which the Commission requires prior to granting a license.

That such development can and will occur seems certain. One possible example is furnished by a news story which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on February 2, 1961. The news item stated that "Plans for the development of more than 9,000 acres adjoining Commonwealth Edison company's Dresden nuclear power generating plant as an industrial district were announced yesterday by four Chicago real estate firms." This is a case of area development being planned before the nearby nuclear plant even gets its final operating license.

The proposed criteria do not indicate what the Commission does in a case like this. The industrial park near Dresden may pose no problem, but

what would be done in the event that a reactor site had been approved by AEC, the utility had virtually completed the plant, and then a real estate operator started building several thousand homes in the "low population zone" around the reactor? If the Commission were to issue the operating license anyway, it would have to ignore the requirements it previously said were necessary for public health and safety. If it denied the license or required the utility to add containment or operate the reactor at a lower power level, the financial hardship on the utility and its customers could be substantial.

A more likely possibility is that real estate development and outward growth of the nearest population center will occur after a reactor has been licensed and gone into operation. If the Commission's criteria are to be meaningful, it would seem necessary either to prevent such development, withdraw the operating license or require changes in containment or power level to compensate for the shrinkage in the "low population zone" and in the distance to the edge of the nearest population center. However, it is my understanding that the Commission does not have plans for such enforcement actions once a nuclear plant goes into operation.

If the proximity of population to a reactor is as important to public safety as the Commission's proposed criteria indicate, there should be some means established for enforcing them for the period of the operating license -- or until there are solid grounds for amending the license requirements. If the criteria are not to be enforced, it is not clear what is gained by establishing them in the first place.

There seems to be another inconsistency, as far as remoteness from population is concerned, in the Commission attitude in respect to nuclear-powered civilian ships, which the Commission and the Maritime Administration are attempting to develop. If such ships are to be of practical use, presumably

they will have to enter populous harbors on a regular basis, and this implies a different policy for mobile reactors than for stationary reactors despite the greater possibilities for accidents with the former.

To illustrate the point, if one applies the examples cited in Appendix "A" of the proposed criteria to the 70,000 thermal kilowatt U.S.S. Savannah reactor, it should be surrounded by a controlled exclusion area of more than 800 feet in radius and by a "low population zone" about 1.6 miles in width, and should remain at least 2.1 miles from the outer edge of any large city. Obviously, no such requirements are contemplated.

I recognize that the Savannah has been designed and built with special features to enhance the inherent safety of the power plant and, furthermore, that a ship would be in port and near population only intermittently. Nevertheless the Navy apparently believes that its nuclear-powered vessels, also designed for maximum safety, require special operating limitations. Last year, Admiral H. G. Rickover testified that the Navy has been issued orders that "there must be an actual military or national necessity before a nuclear ship can go into a populated harbor".

It is not clear why the Commission should have what seems to be a different attitude toward distance from population for civilian nuclear ships than it does for stationary reactors.

The lack of population control in the vicinity of a reactor once the site has been approved and the license issued, and the seemingly different philosophies which AEC applies to stationary and civilian ship reactors appear to us to raise basic questions about the site criteria applying to the proximity of reactors to population. In raising these questions, we do not mean to imply that we are opposed to the separation of reactors from population centers. We do believe that whatever criteria are applied should be reasonably clear, consistent and enforceable.