FROM Sen. Dick Clerke (ele			FILE LOCAMON Onicompletion deadune:
		5/10/17/3	5//10//73
10		ACTION PROCESSING DATES	PREPARE FOR SIGNATURE OF
OCL	a de la composición d	Acknowledged	Chairman
		Interim Report Final	Director of Regulation XOGC
	Original	Copy Dther	REMARKS
re efforts of John	Laitner to a	owa City, w/cy newsclipping ppear "as a full party to rnold Energy Center	Address reply to: Honorable Dick Clark United States Senator Federal Building Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401
	•		"Dear Senator Clark"
REFERRED TO	DATE	IS NOTIFICATION TO THE JCAE	
Shapar f/action	5/7/73	RECOMMENDED ?	Return incoming attachment with response, indicate on outgoing
Cys: PDR (50-331)- Docket File	5		ltr Copy sent PDR
DO NOT DETACH THIS COPY	· · ·	DIRECTOR OF REGULATION	1 Form HQ - 32 (6 - 70) USA EC

United States Senate

May 1, 1973

Respectfully referred to:

Congressional Liaison Atomic Energy Commission Washington, D.C. 20545

RE: Jim R. Hulbert Iowa City, Iowa

In replying, refer to: 102/kg

Because of the desire of this office to be responsive to all inquiries and communications, your consideration of the attached is requested. Your findings and views, in duplicate form, along with return of the enclosure, will be appreciated by

Rec'd Uff. Dir. of Reg. Date 5/1/73

Time 2 %. Vice Clark

Please reply to:

Form #2

SENATOR DICK CLARK Federal Building Ceder Rapids, Iowa 52401 - 'They Can Simply Wipe You Out on Procedural Grounds' -

Environmentalist Facing Opposition, Frustration

hen John A. Laitner wrote tter last fall asking to take ; in hearings on a nuclear er plant being built near Rapids, he little knew t was in store for him. Since then, he's been laborisly trying to make his way ough a maze of federal reguons, calculated, he thinks. exclude the public from the omic Energy Commiss i o n EC) hearing process. Frustrated repeatedly on produral grounds. Laitner ap-ars to have little chance of tting into the issue he wants discuss before the AEC: Wheor nuclear power plants such the one being built near Ced-Rapids are safe, or even cessary.

Assisted by the Iowa Student blic Interest Research Group G) but mostly working Laitner faces some formuble opposition: An array of avers and technical experts whing for the electrical comnies building the Duane Arnd Energy Center at Palo, "thwest of Cedar Rapids. 'le heard from them not long er he read a newspaper ar-He announcing a hearing on the Palot plant's license, and forming persons interested in a hearing that they could file ctitions to "intervene" in the proceedings.

Presuming that the announceout meant what it said, Laitner wrote a letter to the AEC, asking to appear "as a full party to the proceedings."

Within five days, attorneys for the power companies countered with a brief asking the AEC to turn down Laitner's request. They said Laitner had not complied with AEC rules that require petitions to intervene to be filed under oath, accompanied by an affidavit showing the petitioner's interest in the proceedings and telling what the petitioner wants to say at the hearing.

All that come as a surprise to Laitner.

"I immediately wrote to Sen. (Harold) Hughes and other people to find out what I should do," he said.

Laitner ultimately obtained legal assistance through ISPIRG and went to work on amending his petition to meet the AEC requirements.

Meanwhile, two days after the power companies attorneys filed their brief opposing Laitner's petition to take part in the AEC proceedings, the companies sent representatives, to Laitner's home to set him straight on his questions about the Palo nuclear power plant.

Laitner said afterward that his uninvited guests did not want to discuss his concerns about nuclear energy in general:

The questions that Laitner



JOHN LAITNER

asked the companies' representatives at the meeting in his home have now been submitted by the power companies as evidence that Laitner should not be allowed to take part in the hearings.

In a brief filed earlier this year, the lawyers for the companies contend that Laituer's questions "are broad policy concerns more appropriate for consideration in ferums other than a licensing proceeding for a specific plant. It seems clear that it is just these types' of issues which Laitner would presume to pursue were he admitted as a party to the proceeding; it is equally clear that such an inquiry in the context of a specific licensing proceeding would be utterly fruitless."

The power companies' brief also contends that Laitner is wrong in what he says about hazards connected with the operation of the Palo plant.

That may be. Laitner concedes, but he asks how he and other concerned citizens can satisfactorily explore their concerns about nuclear energy if they are not allowed to question power company and AEC witnesses at the hearing.

And he says that if operating licenses are granted "plant by plant by plant" without public discussion of concerns about nuclear energy in general. "you can ignore the total environmental impact" of granting the licenses.

But what concerns Laituer most of all is the tedious, complex and expensive procedures an ordinary citizen has to go through to become involved in the licensing procedure.

"Unless you have financial and technical backing, you are excluded. This is far beyond what the hearing process means." he says

The hearing now is scheduled for May 3, and so far, the only right Laitner has is to make a limited appearance of no more than five minutes. He will not be permitted to ask any questions.

I question whether in fact

kinn that its

with the bet you

John

retri

Duane

FEC.

rit r

20 S

5-

Ser Club

this is in the public interest; whether they have the right to deny the public the right to ask these kinds of questions," he says.

Wednesday, April 18, 1973-Jowa City Pre: 1

"They can simply wipe you out on procedural grounds without ever getting into substantive issues."

ne but