



DOCKET NUMBER

PROD. & UTIL. 50-275,323

RECEIVED

July 1, 1974

'74 JUL 5 PM 4:20

Office of the Secretary of the Commission
United States Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

attn: Chief, Public Proceedings Staff

Acknowledged

7-9-74, ora

In compliance with instructions during a telephone conversation on July 1, with Mrs. Elizabeth S. Bowers and Philip A. Crane, Jr., I submit my objections to the testing of the shoreline discharge at Diablo Canyon in writing, and hope that the board will make a quick ruling, as tests are scheduled to continue.

On June 29, P. G.&E. began discharging sea water from the plant's shoreline structure. The result was a turbulence that caused a yellow-brown discoloration of the water inside most of Diablo Cove and a substantial area outside the cove.

I object to the testing of the discharge structure for two reasons.

1. Sediment buildup and turbidity may damage the abalone and urchin population in and around the cove, and may impede growth or destroy the new crop of bull kelp juveniles that are developing at this time of the year. Sunlight is as much a factor as temperature in kelp development.
2. The holding of any operation of the discharge until discovery has been made at the operating license hearings regarding its impact on commercial diving, is important to my case as an intervenor.

For P. G. & E. to continue the refinement of the shoreline discharge through its operation, under the assumption that it is going to be used, would give them an impartial advantage at the hearings.

The applicant is doing more than checking out pumps. What does it take to check out a pump? Such tests are not crucial to the progression of the plant at this time. These "routine tests" should be stopped, for regardless of any future findings that relate to my particular interests, they help build up a momentum for the employment of the proposed discharge, that would be hard to check at the time of the hearings.

If the applicant is to continue operating the discharge, their position will be evaluated with an increased degree of bias at the hearings. The already constructed structure is advantage enough.

The discharge structure was constructed before I petitioned to intervene. Subsequent to my petition, and the particular contentions that are raised as they relate to diving, the situation



changes. Where other tests may be allowed in the routine progress of the plant, any operation of what is now to be an area of contention, the discharge structure, is no longer a "routine test". My success in making a case at the hearings is contingent on the complete inoperation of the discharging of water.

As I have said in my petition, If the applicant is allowed to answer questions pertaining to the nature of the place, before completion of the model, the degree of acceptable irreversible damage to the marine environment will increase.

If I am to be a viable intervener, these tests should be stopped.

Sincerely Yours,

William P. Corbett

William P. Corbett

CC.

Elizabeth S. Bowers, Esq.
Mr. Glen O. Bright
Dr. William E. Martin
Lawrence J. Chandler, Esq.
Philip A. Crane, Jr., Esq.
Andrew J. Skaff, Esq.
Mr. Frederick Eissler
Ms. Sandra A. Silver
Ms. Elizabeth E. Apfelberg

11-11-52

