UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

50-266
-301
-305

Regulatory File Cy.

AUG 15 1969

Honorable John W. Byrnes
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Byrnes:

I am pleased to reply to your letter of June 24, 1969, concerning the letter you have received from the Wisconsin Ecological Society (WES) and its quotation of remarks made by Dr. Dean E. Abrahamson of the University of Minnesota.

In applications for construction permits, utilities include estimates of liquid and gaseous releases based on preliminary design, and on experience with similar reactors under normal and expected operating conditions. These estimates are necessarily subject to some variations under actual operating conditions. It is significant to note that while actual releases after operation of a nuclear plant begins may in some cases exceed initial estimates, experience with operating power reactors shows that such releases of radioactivity in effluents generally have been only a few percent of release limits authorized by the Commission. A summary of releases in air and water from licensed power reactors during 1967 and 1968 is enclosed.

The release of radioactive materials to the environment in effluents from Atomic Energy Commission licensed nuclear power reactors, and other nuclear facilities, is governed by the AEC regulation, 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation." The limits in Part 20 are based on guides developed by the Federal Radiation Council and approved by the President for the guidance of Federal agencies. In evaluating acceptable risk from radiation exposure the Federal Radiation Council uses the best technical expertise in the field and takes into account the recommendations of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements and the International Commission on Radiological Protection." We are enclosing a copy of Part 20 in accordance with your request.

The Part 20 limits on concentrations of radioactivity permitted in any nuclear power reactor liquid effluents leaving a restricted area, prior

X

to dilution in a stream or other body of water, are such that a member of the public could use the effluent as his sole source of drinking water throughout his lifetime without exceeding the FRC radiation protection guide for an individual in the population from this source of exposure. Concentrations in the effluents, of course, are further reduced by dilution in the body of water into which they are discharged.

Limits on rates of release of radioactive gases into the environment from nuclear power plants are established by conservatively computing the release rate which, at the point of highest radiation level averaged over a period of one year, on or beyond the site boundary, would result in an exposure to the whole body of a hypothetical individual, present throughout the year at the point of highest radiation level, equal to the radiation protection guide recommended by the FRC for an individual in the population. For most sites the highest offsite radiation level occurs on the site boundary. However, topographical and meteorological characteristics of some sites may be such that the point of highest radiation level may be a short distance beyond the site boundary. At greater distances, radiation levels decrease due to diffusion, dispersion and decay of the radioactive material. Thus, the maximum exposures to people from releases of radioactivity from nuclear power reactors permitted under AEC regulations will in general be much lower than the FRC radiation protection guide for individuals in the population, which is used as a basis for calculating release rate limits.

We do not know the basis upon which Dr. Abrahamson estimated the costs of reducing emissions from nuclear power plants to zero. The additional capital expenditure and the additional annual operating costs to achieve this result would depend upon the particular nuclear plant design. The use of additional purification equipment to eliminate liquid emissions has been proposed for the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District's Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, which is a type similar to the Kewaunee and Point Beach nuclear plants under construction in Wisconsin.

The Rancho Seco plant differs from most nuclear plants in that a large supply of cooling water such as a river or lake is not conveniently available. The main difference between the Rancho Seco reactor and other pressurized water power reactor designs is that liquid effluents will not be discharged into a local body of water at the site.

A special, more elaborate radioactive waste treatment system is provided which includes additional stages of ion exchange demineralizers and additional tanks for liquid storage. The processed liquids are stored for reuse and concentrated radioactive wastes are converted to solid waste material, sealed in drums, and transported offsite by a licensed waste disposal contractor. While this would reduce to near zero radioactive effluents in liquid form, the processes involved in making this possible could increase the proportion of radioactivity that is discharged to the atmosphere in gaseous form (predominantly the radioactive gas, tritium).

With respect to the statement that the AEC had "overruled" a suggestion by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission (WPSC) for additional safety equipment for the Kewaunee plant, we are informed by the Wisconsin Public Service Corporation that there have been no discussions between them and WPSC regarding the need for additional safety equipment, nor has that agency suggested to them the need for such equipment. The AEC did correspond with WPSC in June of 1967, regarding the WPSC "Findings of Fact, Permit, Certificate and Order" authorizing Wisconsin-Michigan Power Company to construct and operate the Point Beach I nuclear power plant. This correspondence concerned certain aspects of the WPSC document relating to design of the plant, but not related to additional abatement equipment. Enclosed is a copy of the AEC letter dated June 23, 1967, and the WPSC reply dated June 27, 1967.

Sincerely,

Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation

Enclosures:
1. Summary of Releases
2. 10 CFR Part 20
3. Cpy ltr fm AEC to WPSC, dtd June 23, 1967
4. Cpy ltr fm WPSC to AEC, dtd June 27, 1967

Operating Experience on Releases of Radioactivity in Air and Water from Nuclear Power Reactors 1967-1968

The release of radioactive materials in liquid and gaseous effluents from nuclear power reactors and other AEC licensed nuclear facilities is governed by the Atomic Energy Commission's regulation, 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation." The following Tables I and II provide information on actual releases of radioactivity in liquid and gaseous effluents from 14 licensed nuclear power reactors in 1967. Tables III and IV provide similar information on 11 licensed power reactors for 1968.

Radioactive Releases in Liquid Effluents - Tables I (1967) and III (1968)

Licenses authorizing the operation of nuclear power reactors limit concentrations in liquid effluents to concentrations given in Appendix B, Part 20. Note 1 of Appendix B requires that the concentration permitted for any one radioisotope take into account other radioisotopes that may be present. Under this requirement an individual member of the general public could use continuously the water released by a nuclear power reactor without exceeding radiation protection guides developed by the Federal Radiation Council, the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, or the International Commission on Radiological Protection.

Actual use of Note 1, Appendix B, to compute the gross activity limit that must be met would require the licensee to determine the radioistopic composition of the radioactivity in the effluent. The licensee may elect, under the provisions of Note 2, to forego some of all of such determinations if he uses more restrictive limits which assume that all of the unidentified radioisotopes in the mixture have the same concentration limit as does the most restrictive radioisotope which has not been determined to be absent from the unidentified portion of the mixture.

Tables I and III of this attachment list for each of the operating licensed nuclear power reactors the curies of fission and corrosion products (second column), and the curies of tritium (fifth column) released in effluent waters. Part 20 concentration limit for fission and corrosion products which the licensee elected to use, in accordance with the conditions of

Appendix B, Part 20, and the percent of that limit actually utilized are shown in the third and fourth columns, respectively. The limit of 1×10^{-7} μc/ml selected by most of the licensees is sufficiently restrictive that it can be used for any mixture of fission and corrosion products without any identification of the specific radionuclides present in the mixture. The typical radionuclides present in water effluents from power reactors are such that, if the licensee wishes to identify them and measure their concentrations by radioisotopic analysis, limits which are less restrictive than 1×10^{-7} μc/ml by a factor of 100 or more could be selected. For five of the reactors shown in Table I the licensee elected to perform radioisotopic analysis and use a less restrictive limit.

Radioactive Releases in Gaseous Effluents - Tables II (1967) and IV (1968)

In practice, releases of radioactivity from nuclear power reactors to the atmosphere are controlled by release rate limits incorporated in the respective operating licenses. Each release rate limit is designed to make it unlikely that any individual in the vicinity of the reactor will be exposed to radiation in excess of FRC or ICRP radiation protection guides. To provide this assurance, there is computed for each reactor release rate limits in the atmosphere, taking into account local meteorology, geography, utilization and land and pathways of exposures of people. Simplicity of operation and a high degree of effectiveness are achieved by the development of limits for two basic groups of radioisotopes

a. noble and activation gases, and

b. halogens and particulates.

By assuming that each group consists entirely of the most hazardous isotope likely to occur, limits for the total activity of each group can be established which at the same time are conservative from the point of view of radiation protection and minimize the effort required by the licensee to meet the limit and demonstrate that he has done so.

Tables II and IV list for each of the operating licensed nuclear power reactors the number of curies of radioactivity released, the limit in the license condition, and number of curies permitted to be released, and the percent of that limit actually utilized.

TABLE I

RELEASES OF RADIOACTIVITY FROM POWER REACTORS IN LIQUID EFFLUENTS, 1967

	MIXED FISSION & CORROSION PRODUCTS			TRITIUM	
Reactor	Released (Ci)	Concentration [1] Limit (10^{-7} uCi/ml)	Percent of Limit [2]	Released (Ci)	Percent of MPC [3]
BIG ROCK	10	2	58	[4]	
DRESDEN 1	4.3	1	35	[4]	
HUMBOLDT BAY	3.1	1	17	[4]	
INDIAN POINT 1	28	30	1.3	297	<1
YANKEE	0.056	10	<1	1589	<1
CONN. YANKEE	0.39	30	<1	123	<1
SAXTON	0.02	1	<1	6	<1
ELK RIVER	0.46	1	<1	12	<1
PEACH BOTTOM	0.002	1	<1	[4]	
BONUS	0.035	1	<1	[4]	
LACROSSE	<0.005	1	<1	[4]	
FERMI	0.04	1	<1	[4]	
SANONOFRE	0.32	1	<1		
PATHFINDER	0.19	1	89		
	0.30 [5]	300	<1		

1/ 2/ 3/, 4/, 5/ See notes on next page

1/ Facility licenses require that the release of radioactive liquids in plant effluents be in accordance with 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation." Where there is a mixture of more than one radionuclide in the effluent, the permissible concentration is dependent upon the extent to which the licensee determines the isotopic composition of the mixture. In recognition of the time and effort required to provide complete information on the mixture, Note 3 of Appendix B to Part 20 provides a table for determining the limiting permissible concentration if it can be demonstrated that certain isotopes are not present. The values selected by licensees from that table are shown in this column.

2/ In view of the considerations expressed in Note 1 above, the values given in this column represent upper bounds to the percentage of a limit that would be applicable on the basis of a complete analysis of the composition. Limits based on complete analysis, if performed, would be expected to be substantially higher than those used and the percentages in this column would be substantially less.

3/ The maximum permissible concentration of tritium in water is 3×10^{-3} uCi/ml.

4/ These reactors use no lithium or boron in the primary coolant and their only significant source of tritium is fission. The fraction of fissions producing tritium is so small that none of these reactors can produce 100 curies per year, and most of the tritium produced is retained in the fuel elements until they are dissolved in a chemical reprocessing plant.

5/ These data are for the first 8 months and the last 4 months of 1967, respectively. During the first 8 months the licensee used the concentration limit for a completely unidentified mixture of radioisotopes. When it became evident that the average concentration for the year would probably exceed that level, he made sufficient analyses to demonstrate that the MPC would not be less than 3×10^{-5} uCi/ml.

TABLE II

RELEASES OF RADIOACTIVITY FROM POWER REACTORS IN GASEOUS EFFLUENTS, 1967

Reactor	NOBLE AND ACTIVATION GASES			HALOGENS AND PARTICULATES		
	Curies		% Permissible	Curies		% Permissible
	Released	Permissible*		Released	Permissible**	
HUMBOLDT BAY	900,000	1,600,000	57	0.64	5.7	11
ELK RIVER	4,400	19,000	23	0.003	0.1	3
BONUS***	1,300,000	45,000,000	3	0.0038	215	< 1
PATHFINDER	5,900	470,000	1.3	0.2	2.2	9
DRESDEN 1	260,000	22,000,000	1.1	0.039	100	< 1
YANKEE	2.3	6,300	< 1	Neg.	0.03	< 1
BIG ROCK	264,000	31,000,000	< 1	0.25	38	< 1
INDIAN POINT 1	23	1,600,000	< 1	Neg.	7	< 1
PEACH BOTTOM	7.5	19,000	< 1	Neg.	0.09	< 1
SAXTON	22	3,750	< 1	0.0025	10	< 1
CONN. YANKEE	0.02	28,000	< 1	.001	0.2	< 1
SAN ONOFRE	4	170,000	< 1	Neg.	0.8	< 1
FERMI	0.014	8,800	< 1	Neg.	7	< 1
LACROSSE	< 5	151,000	< 1	Neg.	0.8	< 1

* Where the technical specifications express a release limit in terms of a constant factor times the 10 CFR Part 20 concentration limits, the MPC used is 3×10^{-8} uCi/cc. This MPC is based on typical noble mixture release with less than 2 hours holdup. (For holdup longer than 2 hours the MPC is larger)

** Where the technical specifications do not state an annual limit for the iodines and particulates, an MPC value of 1×10^{-10} uCi/cc was used. This MPC is based on the most restrictive isotope normally found - I-131. The annual limit was reduced by a factor of 700 to account for reconcentration.

*** Permissible release rate based on average wind directions from BONUS final hazards summary report PRWRA-GNEC

TABLE III

RELEASES OF RADIOACTIVITY FROM POWER REACTORS IN LIQUID EFFLUENTS, 1968

Facility	MIXED FISSION & CORROSION PRODUCTS			TRITIUM	
	Released (Ci)	Concentration Limit[1] (10^{-7} uCi/ml)	Percent of Limit[2]	Released (Ci)	Percent of MPC[3]
BIG ROCK	7.9	1.5	59	34	< 1
HUMBOLDT BAY	3.2	1	20	7.2	< 1
DRESDEN 1	5.97	1	19	2.9	< 1
CONN. YANKEE	3.8	1	7.3	1735	< 1
LA CROSSE	0.074	1	3	Neg.[4]	----
SAN ONOFRE	1.5	1	2.5	2353	< 1
SAXTON	0.009	1	2.3	7.5	< 1
INDIAN POINT 1	34.6	35	2	787	< 1
ELK RIVER	0.2	120	< 1	8.2	< 1
PEACH BOTTOM	0.00035	1	< 1	Neg.[4]	----
YANKEE	0.009	1	< 1	1170	< 1

1/, 2/, 3/, 4/ - See notes on next page.

NOTES FOR TABLE III

1/ Facility licenses require that the release of radioactive liquids in plant effluents be in accordance with 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation." Where there is a mixture of more than one radionuclide in the effluent, the permissible concentration is dependent upon the extent to which the licensee determined the isotopic composition of the mixture. Part 20 provides formula and procedures for determining the limiting value of concentration for mixtures. In recognition of the time and effort required to provide complete information on the mixture, Note 3 of Appendix B to Part 20 provides a table for determining the limiting permissible concentration if it can be demonstrated that certain isotopes are not present. The values selected or calculated by licensees for 1968 are shown in this column. These values may vary from year to year.

2/ One of the limits specifically mentioned in Note 3.c. of Part 20 is 1×10^{-7} uCi/ml, which is sufficiently restrictive that it can be used for any mixture of fission and corrosion products in water from any nuclear power reactor without any identification of the radioisotopic composition of the mixture. Typical isotopic compositions of radioactivity in water from power reactors are such that limits higher by two orders of magnitude or more are expected to be available to the licensee if he wishes to support them with adequate radioisotopic analyses. The percent of limit given in this column generally represents upper bounds to the value that would be applicable on the basis of a complete analysis of the composition.

3/ The maximum permissible concentration of tritium in water is 3×10^{-3} uCi/ml.

4/ These reactors use no lithium or boron in the primary coolant and their only significant source of tritium is fission. The fraction of fissions producing tritium is small and most of the tritium produced is retained in the fuel elements until they are dissolved in a chemical reprocessing plant.

TABLE IV

RELEASES OF RADIOACTIVITY FROM POWER REACTORS IN GASEOUS EFFLUENTS, 1968

Facility	NOBLE AND ACTIVATION GASES			HALOGENS AND PARTICULATES		
	Curies		Percentage of	Curies		Percentage of
	Released	Permissible	Permissible	Released	Permissible*	Permissible
HUMBOLDT BAY	897,000	1,560,000	57	0.45	5.6	8
ELK RIVER	648	19,000	3.4	Neg.	0.1	< 1
DRESDEN 1	240,000	22,000,000	1.1	0.15	100	< 1
YANKEE	0.66	8,400	< 1	Neg.	0.03	< 1
BIG ROCK	232,000	31,000,000	< 1	0.09	38	< 1
INDIAN POINT 1	55.2	1,600,000	< 1	Neg.	7	< 1
PEACH BOTTOM	106.5	12,600	< 1	Neg.	0.09	< 1
SAXTON	18.6	3,750	< 1	Neg.	10	<.1
CONN. YANKEE	3.7	95,000	< 1	Neg.	0.2	< 1
SAN ONOFRE	4.75	567,000	< 1	Neg.	0.8	<.1
LA CROSSE	Neg. (< 1)	480,000	< 1	Neg.	0.8	< 1

* Where the technical specifications do not state an annual limit for the iodines and particulates, an MPC value of 1×10^{-10} uCi/cc was used. This MPC is based on the most restrictive isotope normally found -- I-131. The annual limit was reduced by a factor of 700 to account for reconcentration.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN
HILL FARMS STATE OFFICE BUILDING
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53702

ARTHUR L. PADRUTT
CHAIRMAN
WALTER J. COLE
COMMISSIONER
STANLEY E. GILBERTSON
COMMISSIONER

JOHN F. GOETZ
SECRETARY

June 27, 1967

266

FILE NO.

Hon. Glenn S. Seaborg
Chairman
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Dear Chairman Seaborg:

Thank you for your informative letter of June 23, 1967, with reference to the first three conditions contained in the Wisconsin Public Service Commission's "Findings of Fact, Permit, Certificate and Order," dated January 24, 1967, authorizing the construction and operation of the Point Beach nuclear power station.

The Public Service Commission of Wisconsin specifically recognizes that the control of radiation hazards from production and utilization facilities, including nuclear reactors, is the exclusive responsibility of the Federal Government. The three provisions referred to above were not intended by this Commission as "conditions" in the sense that there must be mandatory compliance by Wisconsin Michigan Power Company. In view of the Atomic Energy Commission's exclusive authority in the field of radiological safety, these provisions were intended to be merely advisory to the Company and subject, of course, to any different and contrary position the Atomic Energy Commission might choose to adopt.

I hope that this clarifies the matter.

Very truly yours,

Arthur L. Padrutt,
Chairman.

WET/fm

Rec'd Off./Dir. of Reg.
Date 6/30/67
Time 11:00
Both

JUN 2 3 1967

Dear Mr. Padrutt:

The Wisconsin Michigan Power Company has forwarded to the Commission a copy of the Public Service Commission's "Findings of Fact, Permit, Certificate and Order," dated January 24, 1967, authorizing the construction and operation of the Point Beach nuclear power station. The Certificate imposes three conditions upon the design of the facility which appear to be based upon radiological health and safety considerations. We understand that Mr. Howard K. Shapar, our Assistant General Counsel for Licensing and Regulation, discussed this matter with you, Commissioner Walter J. Cole, Mr. William E. Torkelson, your General Counsel, and Mr. Ralph E. Purucker, your chief engineer, on June 9, 1967. In view of your expressed interest in the radiological health and safety aspects of the proposed facility, I thought it might be helpful if I described the requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission which are designed to protect the public health and safety from radiological hazards.

The Congress of the United States has imposed upon the Atomic Energy Commission the responsibility of licensing and regulating the possession and use of atomic energy materials and nuclear facilities in order to protect the health and safety of the public from radiation hazards. With respect to such facilities as nuclear reactors, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, makes it unlawful for any person to begin the construction of a nuclear reactor except under and in accordance with a construction permit issued by the Commission; or to operate a nuclear reactor except under and in accordance with an operating license issued by the Commission.

The Commission's regulations require applicants who propose to build and operate nuclear reactors to include in their applications the technical information required to support the application. The application must include a

safety analysis report containing the technical information required for an evaluation of the safety of the proposed activities, including the suitability of the site; the design of the proposed facility; and the safety features to be engineered into the facility to prevent the occurrence of accidents and to minimize the consequences of any accident which might occur. Thus, the safety analysis report must include a description of the design of the facility pertinent to nuclear safety; the meteorological, hydrological, geological, seismological and other data pertinent to an evaluation of the suitability of the site for the proposed facility; a description of the proposed operating procedures; and a description of the emergency plans which would be observed in the event of an accident. In addition, the safety analysis report includes an accident analysis in which the applicant must postulate credible accidents which could result in the release of radioactivity in the environment. The application must contain information demonstrating that adequate safety features have been engineered into the facility to prevent the occurrence of such accidents and must also demonstrate that even in the unlikely event such an accident occurs despite the engineered safety features, there will be adequate protection for the general public.

All information contained in the application and all correspondence between the AEC and the applicant, including additional information requested by the AEC of the applicant, is available to members of the public.

Each application for a permit to construct a nuclear reactor is evaluated by the technical specialists in the Commission's regulatory staff and also by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. The Advisory Committee is an independent committee established by the Congress to advise the Commission on matters of reactor safety. It is composed of scientists and engineers who are specialists in the various disciplines important to reactor safety.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards and the technical analysis of the safety considerations relevant to the proposed reactor prepared by the AEC's regulatory staff are made public prior to the hearing on the construction permit application. The Atomic Energy Act requires that a public hearing be held on each application for a permit to construct a power or test reactor. These hearings are conducted by an atomic safety and licensing board composed of three members, two of whom are technically qualified and one of whom is experienced in the conduct of administrative proceedings. The Atomic Energy Act provides that state representatives are to be given prompt notice of the filing of an application for a nuclear reactor to be located in their state and afforded the opportunity to offer evidence, interrogate witnesses and advise the Commission as to the application without having to take a position for or against the granting of the application.

The final review within the agency is by the Commissioners themselves. The Commissioners review each initial decision by an atomic safety and licensing board. This is done formally if an appeal is taken from the initial decision, or informally if no appeal is filed.

Before a license (or permit) is issued to an applicant, the Commission must first find that there is reasonable assurance that the applicant will comply with the Commission's regulations; that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered; that the applicant is technically and financially qualified to engage in the proposed activities; and that the issuance of the license to the applicant will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

The license contains such terms and conditions, in addition to those generally prescribed in the Atomic Energy Act and the Commission's regulations, as the Commission considers necessary to protect health and safety. The license is

subject to amendment, revision, or modification by reason of amendments to the Act or such further regulations or orders as the Commission considers appropriate to protect health and safety.

In summary then, the Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to requirements of statute and implementing regulations, conducts a detailed examination of the various factors which affect the determination whether a particular reactor can be constructed and operated at a particular site without undue risk to the health and safety of the public. Nor does the matter end with the issuance of a license; the licensee remains subject to AEC rules and regulations and continuing inspection and review by the AEC.

Enclosed is a pamphlet, "Licensing of Power Reactors by the Atomic Energy Commission," which traces in more detail the AEC review process for a power reactor license application. We are also enclosing a copy of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and copies of Commission regulations pertinent to the licensing and regulation of nuclear reactors (Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation;" Part 50, "Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities;" Part 55, "Operators' Licenses;" and Part 100, "Reactor Site Criteria").

The Atomic Energy Act reflects the Congressional intent that the control of radiation hazards from production and utilization facilities, including nuclear reactors, be the exclusive responsibility of the Federal Government. This intent is emphasized in Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act which authorizes the transfer of certain regulatory responsibilities from the Commission to the States pursuant to agreement, but makes clear that even in the case of such "Agreement States" the Commission is to retain authority and responsibility over the construction and operation of production and utilization facilities insofar as control of radiation hazards is concerned. A prime Congressional purpose here was to avoid the evils of "dual regulation."

We appreciate that the State of Wisconsin is concerned about all aspects of the health and welfare of its citizens. However, in view of the extensive requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission which must be satisfied before a privately-owned nuclear power reactor can be constructed and operated in the United States, we believe that the State's interest can be served by participation in the AEC licensing process. In this connection, we note that the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin has sought and been granted leave to intervene and participate as a party in the Atomic Energy Commission proceeding on Wisconsin Michigan's construction permit application for the Point Beach Nuclear Power Station. The AEC regulatory staff will be happy to provide whatever assistance it can to facilitate your participation in this proceeding.

Sincerely,

/s/ Glenn T. Seaborg.

Chairman

Mr. Arthur L. Padrutt, Chairman
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
Hill Farms State Office Building
Madison, Wisconson 53702

Enclosures:
Pamphlet
Atomic Energy Act
10 CFR Parts 20, 50, 55 and 100

Distribution:
Chairman Seaborg
Commissioner Johnson
Commissioner Nabrit
Commissioner Ramey
Commissioner Tape
Secretariat (2)
Harold L. Price
REG Central Files
REG Reading
Gladys Ertter (REG)
H. K. Shapar
G. F. Hadlock

OGC OGC

HKShapar:mp JFHennessey

6/19/67 6/ /67