Mr. Dan Shea
3006 Fairmont Avenue
Kettering, OH 45429

Ms. Elizabeth Wallace
P.O. Box 829
Topeka, KS 66601

Mr. Bernard G. Leonard
6118 N. 20th Street
Arlington, VA 22205

Mr. Scott F. Jones
7429 E. 30th Street
Tulsa, OK 74129

Mr. Michael F. Keeley
300 Hobart Drive
Laurel Springs, NJ 08021

Mr. and Mrs. John R. Cooper
R.D. #2
P.O. Box 134
Lancaster, PA 17603

Mr. Fred Silecchia
43-09 Main Street
Flushing, NY 11355

Ms. Susan Swartz
RD 1, Box 265
New Providence, PA 17560

Mr. John Frosina
68-20 Myrtle Ave.
Glendale, NY 11227

Mr. R. F. Harris
58 Seminary St.
New Canaan, CT 06840

Mr. Mark Rogers
2210 Pine Hills Court
Jeffersonville, IN 47130

Mr. Dale J. Seidel
19 University Park Apts.
Amherst, MA 01002

Ms. Kathryn M. Ties
Geyers Church Rd.
Middletown, PA 17057

Ms. Susan K. Reich
585 E. Market St.
Marietta, PA 17547

Ms. Marsha Freeman
Fusion Energy Foundation
G. P. O. Box 1943
New York, NY 10001

Mr. Charles W. Keyser, Jr.
826 Oberlin Road
Middletown, PA 17057

Mr. Robert S. Foster
23 Grinnel Drive
Cedar Cliff Manor
Camp Hill, PA 17011

Mr. Francis Mitchell Carson
608 Montgomery Road
Ambler, PA 19002

Mrs. Gudrun Schlief
RD #2 24-A
Holtwood, PA 17532

Ms. Eunice J. Burkett
801 Walnut Street
Apartment 12
Lemoyne, PA 17043

Ms. Susan Jeffords
44 Maxwell Avenue
Oyster Bay, NY 11771

Mr. Chris Fisher
334-D Willowbrook Dr.
Norrstown, PA 19401

Ms. Louise Monroe
4725 W. Melric Dr.
Santa Ana, CA 92704

Ms. Rhonda Centimole
379 Rt. 9
Bayville, NJ 08721

Mr. John H. Murdock
44 Kensington Drive
Camp Hill, PA 17011

Mr. John Gargivlo
406 W. Marble St.
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Ms. Deborah Feger
71-20 66th St.
Glendale, NY 11227

Mr. Douglas Fenicle
5920 Parkway East
Harrisburg, PA 17112

Mrs. John K. Webb
2 Carter Hill Road
Clinton, CT 06413

Mrs. D. Neidert
222 Riverside Avenue
Buffalo, NY 14207

James L. Wright, Jr., Member
Pennsylvania House of Representatives
116 Hollow Rd.
Levittown, PA 19056

Ms. Eileen Hozella
1704 Pineford Drive
Middletown, PA 17057

Mr. Thomas Iannicari and Ms. Karlene Moeller
444 Harding Avenue
Lyndhurst, NJ 07071

Mr. Marvin I. Lewis
6504 Bradford Terrace
Philadelphia, PA 19149

Mrs. John E. Sharp
1415 Concord Rd.
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Mrs. Ruth Gilbert
1021 Chestnut St.
Columbia, PA 17512

Ms. Jeanette Hardies
187 Washington Avenue
Rochester, NY 14617

Ms. Margaret Hollingsworth
R.D. #2
Columbia, PA 17512

Mr. R. H. Harrison, Sr.
P.O. Box 261
Lawrence, PA 15055

Ms. Jan Goldman
P.O. Box 878
North Fork, CA 93643

Mr. Matthew Signore
68-20 Myrtle Avenue
Glendale, NY 11227

Ms. Rena Marten
Ms. Alexandra Hawryluk
Route 1 Box 100
Cedar Grove, NC 27231

Ms. Green
J. L. Long Middle School
6116 Reiger Avenue
Dallas, TX 75214

Mr. Denzil Hensley
323 Kenwood Drive
Russell, KY 41169

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Dan Shea
3006 Fairmont Avenue
Kettering, OH 45429

Dear Mr. Shea:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

We do not publish general information such as that which you request. We suggest that the best source of such information would be your local library.

Although we regret that we are unable to provide more assistance to you, your interest in these matters is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

STOUFFERS
2399 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY
ARLINGTON, VA. 22202
ROOM # 1012

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

MY NAME IS DAN SHEA AND I AM FROM OHIO, BUT RIGHT NOW IM IN WASHINGTON FOR ~~EA~~ EASTER VACATION. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT YOU THINK OF THE HARRISBURG ACCIDENT? MY OPINION ON NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IS THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE NO ENERGY, EXCEPT NUKLEAR ENERGY AND IF WE START SOON ENOUGH ON STUDYING ENERGY WE WONT HAVE ACCIDENTS LIKE THE ONE IN HARRISBURG. DO YOU THINK THAT THESE POWER PLANTS HAVE ENOUGH SAFETY PRECAUTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC? LASTLY, IF YOU HAVE ANY BROCHURES OR INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR COMMISION COULD YOU SEND IT TO ME?

SINCERELY,
Dan Shea

P.S. AFTER APRIL 9th SEND TO THIS ADDRESS. 3006 FAIRMONT AVE.
KETTERING, OHIO 45429

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Ms. Elizabeth Wallace
P.O. Box 829
Topeka, KS 66601

Dear Ms. Wallace:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power. Your kind comments on the efforts of the Nuclear Regulatory Commisssion are indeed gratifying.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

We do not publish general information such as that which you request. We suggest that the best source of such information would be your local library.

Although we regret that we are unable to provide more assistance to you, your interest in these matters is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Elizabeth Wallace
Box 829
Topeka, Ks.
66601
#234-9566

April 29/79

Mr. H. Benton

Hello my name is Libby you have
heard from me before. I had a message from
God. Well he's pleased, you are doing your
job well! I am so happy that you instigated
the shutdown of 7 power plants.

I Live in Topeka Kansas and wonder
what the chances are of doing the same thing
With the Cooper Nuclear plant? Please send me
some pamplets or information of nuclar power, watch dogs,
and thing that will help me understand more about
the Regulatory Comission and its functions. I am
from Canada but am hospitaliged at the Menninger
foundation in Topeka. Please excuse my Script
it isn't the best.

Thank you (I am 10 years old.)

P.S.
May the Light never be turned off/ May the Force be with you forever.

Libby Wallace

* Solar energy!!

XEO 5/10

8305080335

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:7905030335 DOC.DATE: 79/04/29 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL:
AUTH.NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
WALLACE,E. AFFILIATION UNKNOWN
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
DENTON,H. OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUBJECT: REQUESTS INFO RE COOPER NUCLEAR PLANT & NRC FUNCTIONS.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: XE01S COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL 0 SIZE: 1
TITLE: EXEC. CORRESPONDENCE (NO SPECIFIC DKT. TRANS. TO DENTON/

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
INTERNAL:	GROFF,M.(ORIG)	1	1	TERA/ICY SUPEND	1	1

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 2 ENCL 0

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Scott F. Jones
7429 E. 30th Street
Tulsa, OK 74129

Dear Mr. Jones:

Thank you for your recent letter requesting information on atomic bombs and the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is not involved with atomic bombs. We suggest that the best source of information such as that you request would be your local public library.

With respect to plans or diagrams related to the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2, we suggest that you contact the Metropolitan Edison Company.

Although we regret that we are unable to provide more assistance to you, your interest in these matters is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

7429 E. 30th Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74129
April 10, 1979

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Bethesda, Maryland 09100

Dear Sirs:

I am thinking of writing a science report on the atomic bomb. There are several things that should be made known to me before I start this paper; the first is the critical mass of plutonium and the second is the standard triggering mechanism for the atomic bomb.

I am also interested in the Three Mile Island nuclear facility. Is it possible for you to send me any plans or diagrams for the nuclear facility so I could trace the reactor problems.

Thank you very much for your attention to my letter.

Sincerely yours,

Scott F. Jones

Scott F. Jones

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Michael F. Keeley
300 Hobart Drive
Laurel Springs, NJ 08021

Dear Mr. Keeley:

Your recent letter to Mr. Herbert Kouts concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 and requesting information on nuclear accidents was referred to this office for response.

We do not publish general information such as that which you request. We suggest that the best source of such information would be your local public library.

Although we regret that we are unable to provide more assistance to you, your interest in these matters is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

APRIL 27, 1979

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

HERBERT KNUTS, DIRECTOR

MR KNUTS:

I AM A HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR, AND AM DOING A RESEARCH PAPER ON NUCLEAR ACCIDENTS, AND THEIR EFFECT ON THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY. I WOULD LIKE ANY INFORMATION ON THE ORDEAL AT THREE MILE ISLAND, OR OTHER INCIDENTS. ALSO, I WOULD APPRECIATE SOME OPINIONS ON THE FUTURE REACTORS PLANNED IN THE UNITED STATES. ANY PAMPHLETS, OR INFORMATION WOULD BE A GREAT HELP. PLEASE SEND TO:

MR. MICHAEL F. KEELEY

300 HORAN DRIVE

LAUREL SPRINGS

NEW JERSEY 08021

THANK YOU,

Michael F. Keeley

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

Mr. and Mrs. John R. Cooper
R.D. #2
P.O. Box 134
Lancaster, PA 17603

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Cooper:

Your recent letter to President Carter concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this agency for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

In response to your request, we are enclosing a listing of all the nuclear plants that are planned, under construction or in operation in the United States.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
As stated

Nuclear Electric Generating Units in Operation, Under Construction or Planned

(As of September 30, 1978)

The following listing includes 212 nuclear power reactor electrical generating units which were in operation, under NRC review for construction permits, and ordered or announced by utilities in the United States at the end of September 1978, representing a total capacity of approximately 209,000 MWe. TYPE is indicated by: BWR—boiling water reactor, PWR—pressurized water reactor, HTGR—high temperature gas-cooled reactor, and LMFBR—liquid metal cooled fast breeder reactor. STATUS is indicated by: OL—has operating license, CP—has construction permit, UR—under review for construction permit, A/O—announced or ordered by the utility but application for construction not yet docketed by the NRC for review. The dates for operation are either actual or those scheduled by the utilities (N/S—not yet scheduled).

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
ALABAMA						
Decatur	Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,065	BWR	OL	Tennessee Valley Authority	1974
Decatur	Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,065	BWR	OL	Tennessee Valley Authority	1975
Decatur	Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3	1,065	BWR	OL	Tennessee Valley Authority	1977
Dothan	Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Unit 1	829	BWR	OL	Alabama Power Co.	1978
Dothan	Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Unit 2	829	PWR	CP	Alabama Power Co.	1980
Scottsboro	Bellefonte Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,235	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1981
Scottsboro	Bellefonte Nuclear Plant Unit 2	1,235	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1981

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
ARIZONA						
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	1,270	PWR	CP	Arizona Public Service Co.	1982
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,270	PWR	CP	Arizona Public Service Co.	1984
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 3	1,270	PWR	CP	Arizona Public Service Co.	1986
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 4	1,270	PWR	UR	Arizona Public Service Co.	1988
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 5	1,270	PWR	UR	Arizona Public Service Co.	1990
ARKANSAS						
Russelville	Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 1	850	PWR	OL	Arkansas Power & Light Co.	1974
Russelville	Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 2	912	PWR	OL	Arkansas Power & Light Co.	1978
CALIFORNIA						
Eureka	Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit 3	65	BWR	OL	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	1963
San Clemente	San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	436	PWR	OL	So. Calif. Ed. & San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	1968
San Clemente	San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,140	PWR	CP	So. Calif. Ed. & San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	1980
San Clemente	San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 3	1,140	PWR	CP	So. Calif. Ed. & San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	1981
Diablo Canyon	Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,084	PWR	CP	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	1979
Diablo Canyon	Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,106	PWR	CP	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	1979
Clay Station	Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	917	PWR	OL	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	1975

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
*	Stanislaus Unit 1	1,200	BWR	A/O	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	Indef.
*	Stanislaus Unit 2	1,200	BWR	A/O	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	Indef.
Clay Station	Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,100		A/O	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Indef.
COLORADO						
Platteville	Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Station	330	HTGR	OL	Public Service Co. of of Colorado	1978
CONNECTICUT						
Haddam Neck	Haddam Neck Generating Station	575	PWR	OL	Conn. Yankee Atomic Power Co.	1968
Waterford	Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	660	BWR	OL	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	1971
Waterford	Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	830	PWR	OL	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	1975
Waterford	Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 3	1,159	PWR	CP	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	1986
DELAWARE						
Summit	Summit Power Station Unit 1	1,200		A/O**	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	N/S
FLORIDA						
Florida City	Turkey Point Station Unit 3	693	PWR	OL	Florida Power & Light Co.	1972
Florida City	Turkey Point Station Unit 4	693	PWR	OL	Florida Power & Light Co.	1973
Red Level	Crystal River Plant Unit 3	825	PWR	OL	Florida Power Corp. Light Co.	1977
Ft. Pierce	St. Lucie Plant Unit 1	802	PWR	OL	Florida Power Corp. Light Co.	1976
Ft. Pierce	St. Lucie Plant Unit 2	842	PWR	CP	Florida Power Corp. Light Co.	1983

*Site not selected.

**Limited work authorization issued.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
GEORGIA						
Baxley	Edwin I. Hatch Plant Unit 1	786	BWR	OL	Georgia Power Co.	1975
Baxley	Edwin I. Hatch Plant Unit 2	795	BWR	OL	Georgia Power Co.	1978
Waynesboro	Alvin W. Vogtle, Jr. Plant Unit 1	1,100	PWR	CP	Georgia Power Co.	1984
Waynesboro	Alvin W. Vogtle, Jr. Plant Unit 2	1,100	PWR	CP	Georgia Power Co.	1985
ILLINOIS						
Morris	Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	200	BWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1960
Morris	Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	794	BWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1970
Morris	Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 3	794	BWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1971
Zion	Zion Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,040	PWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1973
Zion	Zion Nuclear Plant Unit 2	1,040	PWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1974
Cordova	Quad-Cities Station Unit 1	789	BWR	OL	Comm. Ed. Co.-Iowa-Ill. Gas & Elec. Co.	1973
Cordova	Quad-Cities Station Unit 2	789	BWR	OL	Comm. Ed. Co.-Iowa-Ill. Gas & Elec. Co.	1973
Seneca	LaSalle County Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,078	BWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1979
Seneca	LaSalle County Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,078	BWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1980
Byron	Byron Station Unit 1	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1981
Byron	Byron Station Unit 2	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1982
Braidwood	Braidwood Unit 1	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1981
Braidwood	Braidwood Unit 2	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1982
Clinton	Clinton Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	950	BWR	CP	Illinois Power Co.	1982
Clinton	Clinton Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	950	BWR	CP	Illinois Power Co.	1988
Savannah	Carroll County Station Unit 1	1,120		A/O	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1984

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Savannah	Carroll County Station Unit 2	1,120		A/O	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1985
INDIANA						
Westchester Town	Bailly Generating Station	660	BWR	CP	Northern Indiana Public Service Co.	1984
Madison	Marble Hill Unit 1	1,130	PWR	CP	Public Service of Indiana	1982
Madison	Marble Hill Unit 2	1,130	PWR	CP	Public Service of Indiana	1984
IOWA						
Pala	Duane Arnold Energy Center Unit 1	538	BWR	OL	Iowa Elec. Light & Power Co.	1975
Vandalia	Iowa Power Unit 1	1,270	BWR	A/O	Iowa Po. & Lt. Co.	N/S
KANSAS						
Burlington	Wolf Creek	1,150	PWR	CP	Kansas Gas & Elec. Co.	1983
LOUISIANA						
Taft	Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3	1,165	PWR	CP	Louisiana Power & Light Co.	1981
St. Francisville	River Bend Station Unit 1	934	BWR	CP	Gulf States Utilities Co.	1984
St. Francisville	River Bend Station Unit 2	934	BWR	CP	Gulf States Utilities Co.	N/S
MAINE						
Wiscasset	Maine Yankee Atomic Power Plant	790	PWR	OL	Maine Yankee Atomic Power Co.	1972
MARYLAND						
Lusby	Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	845	PWR	OL	Baltimore Gas & Elec. Co.	1975
Lusby	Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	845	PWR	OL	Baltimore Gas & Elec. Co.	1977

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Douglas Point	Douglas Point Generating Station Unit 1	1,146	BWR	UR	Potomac Electric Power Co.	Indef.
MASSACHUSETTS						
Rowe	Yankee Nuclear Power Station	175	PWR	OL	Yankee Atomic Elec. Co.	1961
Plymouth	Pilgrim Station Unit 1	655	BWR	OL	Boston Edison Co.	1972
Plymouth	Pilgrim Station Unit 2	1,180	PWR	UR	Boston Edison Co.	1985
Turners Falls	Montague Unit 1	1,150	BWR	UR	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	N/S
Turners Falls	Montague Unit 2	1,150	BWR	UR	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	N/S
MICHIGAN						
Big Rock Point	Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant	72	BWR	OL	Consumers Power Co.	1963
South Haven	Palisades Nuclear Power Station	805	PWR	OL	Consumers Power Co.	1971
Lagoona Beach	Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant Unit 2	1,123	BWR	CP	Detroit Power Co.	1980
Bridgman	Donald C. Cook Plant Unit 1	1,054	PWR	OL	Indiana & Michigan Elec. Co.	1975
Bridgman	Donald C. Cock Plant Unit 2	1,100	PWR	OL	Indiana & Michigan Elec. Co.	1978
Midland	Midland Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	492	PWR	CP	Consumers Power Co.	1982
Midland	Midland Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	818	PWR	CP	Consumers Power Co.	.981
St. Clair County	Greenwood Energy Center Unit 2	1,200	PWR	UR	Detroit Edison Co.	N/S
St. Clair County	Greenwood Energy Center Unit 3	1,200	PWR	UR	Detroit Edison Co.	N/S
MINNESOTA						
Monticello	Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant	545	BWR	OL	Northern States Power Co.	1971
Red Wing	Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Unit 1	530	PWR	OL	Northern States Power Co.	1973

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Red Wing	Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Unit 2	530	PWR	OL	Northern States Power Co.	1974
MISSOURI						
Fulton	Callaway Plant Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Union Elec. Co.	1982
Fulton	Callaway Plant Unit 2	1,150	PWR	CP	Union Elec. Co.	1987
MISSISSIPPI						
Port Gibson	Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,250	BWR	CP	Mississippi Power & Light Co.	1981
Port Gibson	Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,250	BWR	CP	Mississippi Power & Light Co.	1984
Yellow Creek	Yellow Creek Unit 1	1,285	PWR	UR**	Tennessee Valley Auth.	1983
Yellow Creek	Yellow Creek Unit 2	1,285	PWR	UR**	Tennessee Valley Authority	1985
NEBRASKA						
Fort Calhoun	Fort Calhoun Station Unit 1	457	PWR	OL	Omaha Public Power District	1973
Brownville	Cooper Nuclear Station	778	BWR	OL	Nebraska Public Power District	1974
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Seabrook	Seabrook Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,194	PWR	CP	Public Service of N.H.	1983
Seabrook	Seabrook Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,194	PWR	CP	Public Service of N.H.	1985
NEW JERSEY						
Toms River	Oyster Creek Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	650	BWR	OL	Jersey Central Power & Light Co.	1969
Forked River	Forked River Generating Station Unit 1	1,070	PWR	CP	Jersey Central Power & Light Co.	1984

**Limited work authorization issued.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Salem	Salem Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	1,090	PWR	OL	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1977
Salem	Salem Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,115	PWR	CP	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1979
Salem	Hope Creek Generating Station Unit 1	1,067	BWR	CP	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1984
Salem	Hope Creek Generating Station Unit 2	1,067	BWR	CP	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1986
Little Egg Inlet	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 1	1,150	PWR	UR	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
Little Egg Inlet	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 2	1,150	PWR	UR	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
*	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 3	1,150	PWR	A/O	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
*	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 4	1,150	PWR	A/O	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
NEW YORK						
Indian Point	Indian Point Station Unit 1	265	PWR	OL	Consolidated Edison Co.	1962
Indian Point	Indian Point Station Unit 2	873	PWR	OL	Consolidated Edison Co.	1973
Indian Point	Indian Point Station Unit 3	965	PWR	OL	Consolidated Edison Co.	1976
Scriba	Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit 1	610	BWR	OL	Niagara Mohawk Power Co.	1969
Scriba	Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,080	BWR	CP	Niagara Mohawk Power Co.	1983
Ontario	R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	490	PWR	OL	Rochester Gas & Elec. Co.	1970
Brookhaven	Shoreham Nuclear Power Station	854	BWR	CP	Long Island Lighting Co.	1980
Scriba	James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant	821	BWR	OL	Power Authority of State of N.Y.	1975

*Site not selected.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Long Island	Jamesport Unit 1	1,150	PWR	UR	Long Island Lighting Co.	1988
Long Island	Jamesport Unit 2	1,150	PWR	UR	Long Island Lighting Co.	1990
*	New Haven 1	1,250	PWR	A/O	N.Y. State Elec. & Gas. Co.	Indef.
*	New Haven 2	1,250	PWR	A/O	N.Y. State Elec. & Gas Co.	Indef.
Sterling	Sterling Power Project Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Rochester Gas & Elec. Co.	1988
Cementon	Greene County Nuclear Power Plant	1,270	PWR	UR	Power Authority of State of N.Y.	1986
*	Mid-Hudson East 1	1,300		A/O	Empire State Power Resources	N/S
*	Nine Mile Point 3	1,300		A/O	Empire State Power Resources	N/S
NORTH CAROLINA						
Southport	Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Unit 2	821	BWR	OL	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1975
Southport	Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Unit 1	821	BWR	OL	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1977
Cowans Ford Dam	Wm. B. McGuire Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,180	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1979
Cowans Ford Dam	Wm. B. McGuire Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,180	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1981
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 1	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1983
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 2	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1985
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 3	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1989
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 4	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1987
Davie Co.	Perkins Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,280	PWR	UR	Duke Power Co.	1988
Davie Co.	Perkins Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,280	PWR	UR	Duke Power Co.	1991
Davie Co.	Perkins Nuclear Station Unit 3	1,280	PWR	UR	Duke Power Co.	1993

*Site not selected.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
*	Carolina P&L Unit 8	1,150	PWR	A/O	Carolina Power & Light Co.	—
*	Carolina P&L Unit 9	1,150	PWR	A/O	Carolina Power & Light Co.	—
OHIO						
Oak Harbor	Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	906	PWR	OL	Toledo Edison-Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1977
Oak Harbor	Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	906	PWR	UR**	Toledo Edison-Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1986
Oak Harbor	Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit 3	906	PWR	UR**	Toledo Edison-Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1988
Perry	Perry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,205	BWR	CP	Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1981
Perry	Perry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,205	BWR	CP	Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1983
Moscow	Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	810	BWR	CP	Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co.	1979
Berlin Hgts.	Erie Unit 1	1,260	PWR	UR	Ohio Edison Co.	1986
Berlin Hgts.	Erie Unit 2	1,260	PWR	UR	Ohio Edison Co.	1988
OKLAHOMA						
Inola	Black Fox Unit 1	1,150	BWR	UR**	Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	1983
Inola	Black Fox Unit 2	1,150	BWR	UR**	Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	1985
OREGON						
Prescott	Trojan Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,130	PWR	OL	Portland General Elec. Co.	1976
Arlington	Pebble Springs Unit 1	1,260	PWR	UR	Portland General Elec. Co.	1986
Arlington	Pebble Springs Unit 2	1,260	PWR	UR	Portland General Elec. Co.	1989

*Site not selected.
**Limited work authorization issued.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
PENNSYLVANIA						
Peach Bottom	Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Unit 2	1,065	BWR	OL	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1974
Peach Bottom	Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Unit 3	1,065	BWR	OL	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1974
Pottstown	Limerick Generating Station Unit 1	1,065	BWR	CP	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1983
Pottstown	Limerick Generating Station Unit 2	1,065	BWR	CP	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1985
Shippingport	Shippingport Atomic Power Unit 1	90	PWR	—[1]	Duquesne Light Co. & ERDA	NA
Shippingport	Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 1	852	PWR	OL	Duquesne Light Co. Ohio Edison Co.	1976
Shippingport	Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 2	852	PWR	CP	Duquesne Light Co. Ohio Edison Co.	1982
Goldsboro	Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 1	819	PWR	OL	Metropolitan Edison Co.	1974
Goldsboro	Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2	906	PWR	OL	Metropolitan Edison Co.	1978
Berwick	Susquehanna Steam Electric Station Unit 1	1,052	BWR	CP	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	1980
Berwick	Susquehanna Steam Electric Station Unit 2	1,052	BWR	CP	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	1982
Fulton	Fulton Generating Station Unit 1	1,160		UR	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	N/S
Fulton	Fulton Generating Station Unit 2	1,160		UR	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	N/S
RHODE ISLAND						
No. Kingston	New England Unit 1	1,194	PWR	UR	New England Power Co.	1987
No. Kingston	New England Unit 2	1,194	PWR	UR	New England Power Co.	1989
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Hartsville	H. B. Robinson S. E. Plant Unit 2	700	PWR	OL	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1971
Seneca	Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 1	887	PWR	OL	Duke Power Co.	1973

[1]Operable but OL not required.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Seneca	Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 2	887	PWR	OL	Duke Power Co.	1974
Seneca	Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 3	887	PWR	OL	Duke Power Co.	1974
Broad River	Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Unit 1	900	PWR	CP	So. Carolina Elec. & Gas Co.	1980
Lake Wylie	Catawba Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,145	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1981
Lake Wylie	Catawba Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,145	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1983
Cherokee County	Cherokee Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,280	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1984
Cherokee County	Cherokee Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,280	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1986
Cherokee County	Cherokee Nuclear Station Unit 3	1,280	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1988

TENNESSEE

Daisy	Sequoyah Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,140	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1979
Daisy	Sequoyah Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,140	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1980
Spring City	Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,165	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1979
Spring City	Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Unit 2	1,165	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1980
Oak Ridge	Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant	350	LMFBR	UR	U.S. Government	Indef.
Hartsville	TVA Plant 1 Unit 1	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1982
Hartsville	TVA Plant 1 Unit 2	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1983
Hartsville	TVA Plant 2 Unit 1	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1983
Hartsville	TVA Plant 2 Unit 2	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1984
Phipps Bend	Phipps Bend Unit 1	1,220	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1983
Phipps Bend	Phipps Bend Unit 2	1,220	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1984

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
TEXAS						
Glen Rose	Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Texas P&L, Dallas P&L, Texas Elec. Service	1981
Glen Rose	Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Unit 2	1,150	PWR	CP	Texas P&L, Dallas P&L, Texas Elec. Service	1983
Wallis	Allens Creek Unit 1	1,213	BWR	UR	Houston Lighting & Power Co.	1985
Bay City	South Texas Nuclear Project Unit 1	1,250	PWR	CP	Houston Lighting & Power Co.	1980
Bay City	South Texas Nuclear Project Unit 2	1,250	PWR	CP	Houston Lighting & Power Co.	1982
VERMONT						
Vernon	Vermont Yankee Generating Station	514	BWR	OL	Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.	1972
VIRGINIA						
Gravel Neck	Surry Power Station Unit 1	822	PWR	OL	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1972
Gravel Neck	Surry Power Station Unit 2	822	PWR	OL	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1973
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 1	907	PWR	OL	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1978
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 2	907	PWR	CP	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1979
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 3	907	PWR	CP	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1982
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 4	907	PWR	CP	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1983
*	Central Virginia 1	1,150		A/O	American Electric Power Co.	1990
*	Central Virginia 2	1,150		A/O	American Electric Power Co.	1990
WASHINGTON						
Richland	N-Reactor/WPPSS Steam	850	GR	—[1]	Wash. Public Power Supply System	

*Site not selected.

[1] Operable but OL not required.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Richland	WPPSS No. 1 (Hanford)	1,267	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1982
Richland	WPPSS No. 2 (Hanford)	1,103	BWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1980
Satsop	WPPSS No. 3	1,242	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1984
Richland	WPPSS No. 4	1,267	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1984
Satsop	WPPSS No. 5	1,242	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1985
Sedro Wooley	Skagit Nuclear Power Project Unit 1	1,277	BWR	UR	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.	1985
Sedro Wooley	Skagit Nuclear Power Project Unit 2	1,277	BWR	UR	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.	1987
WISCONSIN						
Genoa	Genoa Nuclear Generating Station (LaCrosse)	50	BWR	OL	Dairyland Power Coop.	1969
Two Creeks	Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 1	497	PWR	OL	Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.	1970
Two Creeks	Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 2	497	PWR	OL	Wisconsin Michigan Power Co	1972
Carlton	Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	535	PWR	OL	Wisconsin Elec. Power Co.	1974
Durand	Tyrone Energy Park Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Northern States Power Co.	1985
Ft. Atkinson	Haven Nuclear Plant Unit 1	900	PWR	UR	Wisconsin Elec. Power Co.	1987
Ft. Atkinson	Haven Nuclear Plant Unit 2	900	PWR	UR	Wisconsin Elec. Power Co.	1989
PUERTO RICO						
Arecibo	North Coast Nuclear Plant Unit 1	583	PWR	UR	Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority	Indef.

ID NRC 790417024 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

REFERRAL

TO: NRC DATE: APR 17 79

REPLY: DIRECT REPLY. FURNISH INFORMATION COPY

IF MORE THAN 9 DAYS DELAY IS ENCOUNTERED PLEASE TELEPHONE MS. BYRNE 456-2113

BASIC CORRESPONDENCE AND CONTROL SHEET AND COPY OF RESPONSE (OR DRAFT) MUST BE RETURNED TO: AGENCY LIAISON (ROOM 94) WHITE HOUSE.

REMARKS:

X LETTER MAILGRAM TELEGRAM DATED: APR 07 79

TO: PRESIDENT CARTER

FROM: ALICE COOPER, RT. 2, BOX 134, LANCASTER, PA 17603

SUBJECT: EVACUATED FROM 3 MILE ISLAND AREA. REQUESTS INFO AND MAP RE: PROJECTED NUCLEAR PLANT AND DUMP SITES.

RESPONSE:

CLOSED OUT:

BY DIRECTION OF THE PRESIDENT:

PAMELA ZINN

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF CORRESPONDENCE

9

NRC

Dear President Carter,

We are a family who were forced to evacuate the Three Mile Island area, and I never want anyone to have to experience the horror of fleeing their homes, loved ones, and property, potentially forever. We don't want any more nuclear reactors built at all. And the ones that are already in service should be phased out. We would rather do without the electricity than have to live with potential annihilation. Please tell us where we can obtain a map of present and projected nuclear reactors and dump sites, as we wish to plan to move as far away from them as possible. Thank you.

John R. Cooper Sincerely, Alice Cooper

RD #2 Box 134
Lancaster, Pa. 1760[illegible]

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Fred Silecchia
43-09 Main Street
Flushing, NY 11355

Dear Mr. Silecchia:

Your recent letter to Chairman Hendrie concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this office for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

In response to your request, we are enclosing a listing of all the nuclear plants that are planned, under construction or in operation in the United States.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
As stated

Nuclear Electric Generating Units in Operation, Under Construction or Planned

(As of September 30, 1978)

The following listing includes 212 nuclear power reactor electrical generating units which were in operation, under NRC review for construction permits, and ordered or announced by utilities in the United States at the end of September 1978, representing a total capacity of approximately 209,000 MWe. TYPE is indicated by: BWR—boiling water reactor, PWR—pressurized water reactor, HTGR—high temperature gas-cooled reactor, and LMFBR—liquid metal cooled fast breeder reactor. STATUS is indicated by: OL—has operating license, CP—has construction permit, UR—under review for construction permit, A/O—announced or ordered by the utility but application for construction not yet docketed by the NRC for review. The dates for operation are either actual or those scheduled by the utilities (N/S—not yet scheduled).

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
ALABAMA						
Decatur	Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,065	BWR	OL	Tennessee Valley Authority	1974
Decatur	Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,065	BWR	OL	Tennessee Valley Authority	1975
Decatur	Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3	1,065	BWR	OL	Tennessee Valley Authority	1977
Dothan	Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Unit 1	829	BWR	OL	Alabama Power Co.	1978
Dothan	Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Unit 2	829	PWR	CP	Alabama Power Co.	1980
Scottsboro	Bellefonte Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,235	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1981
Scottsboro	Bellefonte Nuclear Plant Unit 2	1,235	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1981

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
ARIZONA						
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	1,270	PWR	CP	Arizona Public Service Co.	1982
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,270	PWR	CP	Arizona Public Service Co.	1984
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 3	1,270	PWR	CP	Arizona Public Service Co.	1986
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 4	1,270	PWR	UR	Arizona Public Service Co.	1988
Winterburg	Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit 5	1,270	PWR	UR	Arizona Public Service Co.	1990
ARKANSAS						
Russelville	Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 1	850	PWR	OL	Arkansas Power & Light Co.	1974
Russelville	Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 2	912	PWR	OL	Arkansas Power & Light Co.	1978
CALIFORNIA						
Eureka	Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit 3	65	BWR	OL	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	1963
San Clemente	San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	436	PWR	OL	So. Calif. Ed. & San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	1968
San Clemente	San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,140	PWR	CP	So. Calif. Ed. & San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	1980
San Clemente	San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 3	1,140	PWR	CP	So. Calif. Ed. & San Diego Gas & Electric Co.	1981
Diablo Canyon	Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,084	PWR	CP	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	1979
Diablo Canyon	Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,106	PWR	CP	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	1979
Clay Station	Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	917	PWR	OL	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	1975

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
	Stanislaus Unit 1	1,200	BWR	A/O	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	Indef.
*	Stanislaus Unit 2	1,200	BWR	A/O	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	Indef.
Clay Station	Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,100		A/O	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Indef.
COLORADO						
Platteville	Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Station	330	HTGR	OL	Public Service Co. of of Colorado	1978
CONNECTICUT						
Haddam Neck	Haddam Neck Generating Station	575	PWR	OL	Conn. Yankee Atomic Power Co.	1968
Waterford	Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	660	BWR	OL	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	1971
Waterford	Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	830	PWR	OL	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	1975
Waterford	Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 3	1,159	PWR	CP	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	1986
DELAWARE						
Summit	Summit Power Station Unit 1	1,200		A/O**	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	N/S
FLORIDA						
Florida City	Turkey Point Station Unit 3	693	PWR	OL	Florida Power & Light Co.	1972
Florida City	Turkey Point Station Unit 4	693	PWR	OL	Florida Power & Light Co.	1973
Red Level	Crystal River Plant Unit 3	825	PWR	OL	Florida Power Corp. Light Co.	1977
Ft. Pierce	St. Lucie Plant Unit 1	802	PWR	OL	Florida Power Corp. Light Co.	1976
Ft. Pierce	St. Lucie Plant Unit 2	842	PWR	CP	Florida Power Corp. Light Co.	1983

*Site not selected.

**Limited work authorization issued.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
GEORGIA						
Baxley	Edwin I. Hatch Plant Unit 1	786	BWR	OL	Georgia Power Co	1975
Baxley	Edwin I. Hatch Plant Unit 2	795	BWR	OL	Georgia Power Co.	1978
Waynesboro	Alvin W. Vogtle, Jr. Plant Unit 1	1,100	PWR	CP	Georgia Power Co.	1984
Waynesboro	Alvin W. Vogtle, Jr. Plant Unit 2	1,100	PWR	CP	Georgia Power Co.	1985
ILLINOIS						
Morris	Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	200	BWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1960
Morris	Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	794	BWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1970
Morris	Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 3	794	BWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1971
Zion	Zion Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,040	PWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1973
Zion	Zion Nuclear Plant Unit 2	1,040	PWR	OL	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1974
Cordova	Quad-Cities Station Unit 1	789	BWR	OL	Comm. Ed. Co.-Iowa-Ill. Gas & Elec. Co.	1973
Cordova	Quad-Cities Station Unit 2	789	BWR	OL	Comm. Ed. Co.-Iowa-Ill. Gas & Elec. Co.	1973
Seneca	LaSalle County Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,078	BWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1979
Seneca	LaSalle County Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,078	BWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1980
Byron	Byron Station Unit 1	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1981
Byron	Byron Station Unit 2	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1982
Braidwood	Braidwood Unit 1	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1981
Braidwood	Braidwood Unit 2	1,120	PWR	CP	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1982
Clinton	Clinton Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	950	BWR	CP	Illinois Power Co.	1982
Clinton	Clinton Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	950	BWR	CP	Illinois Power Co.	1988
Savannah	Carroll County Station Unit 1	1,120		A/O	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1984

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Savannan	Carroll County Station Unit 2	1,120		A/O	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1985
INDIANA						
Westchester Town	Bailly Generating Station	660	BWR	CP	Northern Indiana Public Service Co.	1984
Madison	Marble Hill Unit 1	1,130	PWR	CP	Public Service of Indiana	1982
Madison	Marble Hill Unit 2	1,130	PWR	CP	Public Service of Indiana	1984
IOWA						
Palo	Duane Arnold Energy Center Unit 1	538	BWR	OL	Iowa Elec. Light & Power Co.	1975
Vandalia	Iowa Power Unit 1	1,270	BWR	A/O	Iowa Po. & Lt. Co.	N/S
KANSAS						
Burlington	Wolf Creek	1,150	PWR	CP	Kansas Gas & Elec. Co.	1983
LOUISIANA						
Taft	Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3	1,165	PWR	CP	Louisiana Power & Light Co.	1981
St. Francisville	River Bend Station Unit 1	934	BWR	CP	Gulf States Utilities Co.	1984
St. Francisville	River Bend Station Unit 2	934	BWR	CP	Gulf States Utilities Co.	N/S
MAINE						
Wiscasset	Maine Yankee Atomic Power Plant	790	PWR	OL	Maine Yankee Atomic Power Co.	1972
MARYLAND						
Lusby	Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	845	PWR	OL	Baltimore Gas & Elec. Co.	1975
Lusby	Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	845	PWR	OL	Baltimore Gas & Elec. Co.	1977

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Douglas Point	Douglas Point Generating Station Unit 1	1,146	BWR	UR	Potomac Electric Power Co.	Indef.
MASSACHUSETTS						
Rowe	Yankee Nuclear Power Station	175	PWR	OL	Yankee Atomic Elec. Co.	1961
Plymouth	Pilgrim Station Unit 1	655	BWR	OL	Boston Edison Co.	1972
Plymouth	Pilgrim Station Unit 2	1,180	PWR	UR	Boston Edison Co.	1985
Turners Falls	Montague Unit 1	1,150	BWR	UR	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	N/S
Turners Falls	Montague Unit 2	1,150	BWR	UR	Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.	N/S
MICHIGAN						
Big Rock Point	Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant	72	BWR	OL	Consumers Power Co.	1963
South Haven	Palisades Nuclear Power Station	805	PWR	OL	Consumers Power Co.	1971
Lagoona Beach	Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant Unit 2	1,123	BWR	CP	Detroit Power Co.	1980
Bridgman	Donald C. Cook Plant Unit 1	1,054	PWR	OL	Indiana & Michigan Elec. Co.	1975
Bridgman	Donald C. Cook Plant Unit 2	1,100	PWR	OL	Indiana & Michigan Elec. Co.	1978
Midland	Midland Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	492	PWR	CP	Consumers Power Co.	1982
Midland	Midland Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	818	PWR	CP	Consumers Power Co.	1981
St. Clair County	Greenwood Energy Center Unit 2	1,200	PWR	UR	Detroit Edison Co.	N/S
St. Clair County	Greenwood Energy Center Unit 3	1,200	PWR	UR	Detroit Edison Co.	N/S
MINNESOTA						
Monticello	Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant	545	BWR	OL	Northern States Power Co.	1971
Red Wing	Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Unit 1	530	PWR	OL	Northern States Power Co.	1973

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Red Wing	Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Unit 2	530	PWR	OL	Northern States Power Co.	1974
MISSOURI						
Fulton	Callaway Plant Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Union Elec. Co.	1982
Fulton	Callaway Plant Unit 2	1,150	PWR	CP	Union Elec. Co.	1987
MISSISSIPPI						
Port Gibson	Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,250	BWR	CP	Mississippi Power & Light Co.	1981
Port Gibson	Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,250	BWR	CP	Mississippi Power & Light Co.	1984
Yellow Creek	Yellow Creek Unit 1	1,285	PWR	UR**	Tennessee Valley Authority	1985
Yellow Creek	Yellow Creek Unit 2	1,285	PWR	UR**	Tennessee Valley Authority	1985
NEBRASKA						
Fort Calhoun	Fort Calhoun Station Unit 1	457	PWR	OL	Omaha Public Power District	1973
Brownville	Cooper Nuclear Station	778	BWR	OL	Nebraska Public Power District	1974
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Seabrook	Seabrook Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,194	PWR	CP	Public Service of N.H.	1983
Seabrook	Seabrook Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,194	PWR	CP	Public Service of N.H.	1985
NEW JERSEY						
Toms River	Oyster Creek Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	650	BWR	OL	Jersey Central Power & Light Co.	1969
Forked River	Forked River Generating Station Unit 1	1,070	PWR	CP	Jersey Central Power & Light Co.	1984

**Limited work authorization issued.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Salem	Salem Nuclear Generating Station Unit 1	1,090	PWR	OL	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1977
Salem	Salem Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2	1,115	PWR	CP	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1979
Salem	Hope Creek Generating Station Unit 1	1,067	BWR	CP	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1984
Salem	Hope Creek Generating Station Unit 2	1,067	BWR	CP	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	1986
Little Egg Inlet	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 1	1,150	PWR	UR	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
Little Egg Inlet	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 2	1,150	PWR	UR	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
*	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 3	1,150	PWR	A/O	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
*	Atlantic Generating Station Unit 4	1,150	PWR	A/O	Public Service Elec. & Gas Co.	N/S
NEW YORK						
Indian Point	Indian Point Station Unit 1	265	PWR	OL	Consolidated Edison Co.	1962
Indian Point	Indian Point Station Unit 2	873	PWR	OL	Consolidated Edison Co.	1973
Indian Point	Indian Point Station Unit 3	965	PWR	OL	Consolidated Edison Co.	1976
Scriba	Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit 1	610	BWR	OL	Niagara Mohawk Power Co.	1969
Scriba	Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,080	BWR	CP	Niagara Mohawk Power Co.	1983
Ontario	R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	490	PWR	OL	Rochester Gas & Elec. Co.	1970
Brookhaven	Shoreham Nuclear Power Station	854	BWR	CP	Long Island Lighting Co.	1980
Scriba	James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant	821	BWR	OL	Power Authority of State of N.Y.	1975

*Site not selected.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Long Island	Jamesport Unit 1	1,150	PWR	UR	Long Island Lighting Co.	1988
Long Island	Jamesport Unit 2	1,150	PWR	UR	Long Island Lighting Co.	1990
*	New Haven 1	1,250	PWR	A/O	N.Y. State Elec. & Gas. Co.	Indef.
*	New Haven 2	1,250	PWR	A/O	N.Y. State Elec. & Gas Co.	Indef.
Sterling	Sterling Power Project Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Rochester Gas & Elec. Co.	1988
Cementon	Greene County Nuclear Power Plant	1,270	PWR	UR	Power Authority of State of N.Y.	1986
*	Mid-Hudson East 1	1,300		A/O	Empire State Power Resources	N/S
*	Nine Mile Point 3	1,300		A/O	Empire State Power Resources	N/S
NORTH CAROLINA						
Southport	Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Unit 2	821	BWR	OL	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1975
Southport	Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Unit 1	821	BWR	OL	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1977
Cowans Ford Dam	Wm. B. McGuire Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,180	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1979
Cowans Ford Dam	Wm. B. McGuire Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,180	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1981
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 1	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1983
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 2	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1985
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 3	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1989
Bonsal	Shearon Harris Plant Unit 4	915	PWR	CP	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1987
Davie Co.	Perkins Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,280	PWR	UR	Duke Power Co.	1988
Davie Co.	Perkins Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,280	PWR	UR	Duke Power Co.	1991
Davie Co.	Perkins Nuclear Station Unit 3	1,280	PWR	UR	Duke Power Co.	1993

*Site not selected.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
*	Carolina P&L Unit 8	1,150	PWR	A/O	Carolina Power & Light Co.	—
*	Carolina P&L Unit 9	1,150	PWR	A/O	Carolina Power & Light Co.	—
OHIO						
Oak Harbor	Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	906	PWR	OL	Toledo Edison-Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1977
Oak Harbor	Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit 2	906	PWR	UR**	Toledo Edison-Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1986
Oak Harbor	Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit 3	906	PWR	UR**	Toledo Edison-Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1988
Perry	Perry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,205	BWR	CP	Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1981
Perry	Perry Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,205	BWR	CP	Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.	1983
Moscow	Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station Unit 1	810	BWR	CP	Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co.	1979
Berlin Hgts.	Erie Unit 1	1,260	PWR	UR	Ohio Edison Co.	1986
Berlin Hgts.	Erie Unit 2	1,260	PWR	UR	Ohio Edison Co.	1988
OKLAHOMA						
Inola	Black Fox Unit 1	1,150	BWR	UR**	Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	1983
Inola	Black Fox Unit 2	1,150	BWR	UR**	Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	1985
OREGON						
Prescott	Trojan Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,130	PWR	OL	Portland General Elec. Co.	1976
Arlington	Pebble Springs Unit 1	1,260	PWR	UR	Portland General Elec. Co.	1986
Arlington	Pebble Springs Unit 2	1,260	PWR	UR	Portland General Elec. Co.	1989

*Site not selected.
**Limited work authorization issued.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
PENNSYLVANIA						
Peach Bottom	Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Unit 2	1,065	BWR	OL	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1974
Peach Bottom	Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Unit 3	1,065	BWR	OL	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1974
Pottstown	Limerick Generating Station Unit 1	1,065	BWR	CP	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1983
Pottstown	Limerick Generating Station Unit 2	1,065	BWR	CP	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	1985
Shippingport	Shippingport Atomic Power Unit 1	90	PWR	—[1]	Duquesne Light Co. & ERDA	NA
Shippingport	Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 1	852	PWR	OL	Duquesne Light Co. Ohio Edison Co.	1976
Shippingport	Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 2	852	PWR	CP	Duquesne Light Co. Ohio Edison Co.	1982
Goldsboro	Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 1	819	PWR	OL	Metropolitan Edison Co.	1974
Goldsboro	Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2	906	PWR	OL	Metropolitan Edison Co.	1978
Berwick	Susquehanna Steam Electric Station Unit 1	1,052	BWR	CP	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	1980
Berwick	Susquehanna Steam Electric Station Unit 2	1,052	BWR	CP	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	1982
Fulton	Fulton Generating Station Unit 1	1,160		UR	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	N/S
Fulton	Fulton Generating Station Unit 2	1,160		UR	Philadelphia Elec. Co.	N/S
RHODE ISLAND						
No. Kingston	New England Unit 1	1,194	PWR	UR	New England Power Co.	1987
No. Kingston	New England Unit 2	1,194	PWR	UR	New England Power Co.	1989
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Hartsville	H. B. Robinson S. E. Plant Unit 2	700	PWR	OL	Carolina Power & Light Co.	1971
Seneca	Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 1	887	PWR	OL	Duke Power Co.	1973

[1] Operable but OL not required.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Seneca	Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 2	887	PWR	OL	Duke Power Co.	1974
Seneca	Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 3	887	PWR	OL	Duke Power Co.	1974
Broad River	Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Unit 1	900	PWR	CP	So. Carolina Elec. & Gas Co.	1980
Lake Wylie	Catawba Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,145	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1981
Lake Wylie	Catawba Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,145	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1983
Cherokee County	Cherokee Nuclear Station Unit 1	1,280	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1984
Cherokee County	Cherokee Nuclear Station Unit 2	1,280	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1986
Cherokee County	Cherokee Nuclear Station Unit 3	1,280	PWR	CP	Duke Power Co.	1988

TENNESSEE

Daisy	Sequoyah Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	1,140	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1979
Daisy	Sequoyah Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2	1,140	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1980
Spring City	Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Unit 1	1,165	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1979
Spring City	Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Unit 2	1,165	PWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1980
Oak Ridge	Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant	350	LMFBR	UR	U.S. Government	Indef.
Hartsville	TVA Plant 1 Unit 1	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1982
Hartsville	TVA Plant 1 Unit 2	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1983
Hartsville	TVA Plant 2 Unit 1	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1983
Hartsville	TVA Plant 2 Unit 2	1,205	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1984
Phipps Bend	Phipps Bend Unit 1	1,220	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1983
Phipps Bend	Phipps Bend Unit 2	1,220	BWR	CP	Tennessee Valley Authority	1984

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
TEXAS						
Glen Rose	Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Texas P&L, Dallas P&L, Texas Elec. Service	1981
Glen Rose	Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Unit 2	1,150	PWR	CP	Texas P&L, Dallas P&L, Texas Elec. Service	1983
Wallis	Allens Creek Unit 1	1,213	BWR	UR	Houston Lighting & Power Co.	1985
Bay City	South Texas Nuclear Project Unit 1	1,250	PWR	CP	Houston Lighting & Power Co.	1980
Bay City	South Texas Nuclear Project Unit 2	1,250	PWR	CP	Houston Lighting & Power Co.	1982
VERMONT						
Vernon	Vermont Yankee Generating Station	514	BWR	OL	Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.	1972
VIRGINIA						
Gravel Neck	Surry Power Station Unit 1	822	PWR	OL	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1972
Gravel Neck	Surry Power Station Unit 2	822	PWR	OL	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1973
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 1	907	PWR	OL	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1978
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 2	907	PWR	CP	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1979
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 3	907	PWR	CP	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1982
Mineral	North Anna Power Station Unit 4	907	PWR	CP	Va. Electric & Power Co.	1983
*	Central Virginia 1	1,150		A/O	American Electric Power Co.	1990
*	Central Virginia 2	1,150		A/O	American Electric Power Co.	1990
WASHINGTON						
Richland	N-Reactor/WPPSS Steam	850	GR	—[1]	Wash. Public Power Supply System	

*Site not selected.

[1] Operable but OL not required.

Site	Plant Name	Capacity (Net MWe)	Type	Status	Utility	Commercial Operation
Richland	WPPSS No. 1 (Hanford)	1,267	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1982
Richland	WPPSS No. 2 (Hanford)	1,103	BWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1980
Satsop	WPPSS No. 3	1,242	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1984
Richland	WPPSS No. 4	1,267	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1984
Satsop	WPPSS No. 5	1,242	PWR	CP	Wash. Public Power Supply System	1985
Sedro Wooley	Skagit Nuclear Power Project Unit 1	1,277	BWR	UR	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.	1985
Sedro Wooley	Skagit Nuclear Power Project Unit 2	1,277	BWR	UR	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.	1987
WISCONSIN						
Genoa	Genoa Nuclear Generating Station (LaCrosse)	50	BWR	OL	Dairyland Power Coop.	1969
Two Creeks	Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 1	497	PWR	OL	Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.	1970
Two Creeks	Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 2	497	PWR	OL	Wisconsin Michigan Power Co	1972
Carlton	Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1	535	PWR	OL	Wisconsin Elec. Power Co.	1974
Durand	Tyrone Energy Park Unit 1	1,150	PWR	CP	Northern States Power Co.	1985
Ft. Atkinson	Haven Nuclear Plant Unit 1	900	PWR	UR	Wisconsin Elec. Power Co.	1987
Ft. Atkinson	Haven Nuclear Plant Unit 2	900	PWR	UR	Wisconsin Elec. Power Co.	1989
PUERTO RICO						
Arecibo	North Coast Nuclear Plant Unit 1	583	PWR	UR	Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority	Indef.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. R. F. Harris
58 Seminary St.
New Canaan, CT 06840

Dear Mr. Harris:

Thank you for your recent letter expressing your views on nuclear power and requesting information on nuclear reactors and radioactivity.

We do not publish general information such as that which you request. We suggest that the best source of such information would be your local public library.

Although we regret that we are unable to provide more assistance to you, your interest in these matters is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

58 Simmons St
Glastonbury Conn.
New London Conn
06033
4/5/78

Mr Harold R Denton
Office of Nuclear
Regulation
1717 H Street NW
Washington DC 20555

Dear Mr Denton,

Please send information on
nuclear reactor radioactivity
& fusion & the future of the
nuclear industry

Some chemistry & physics
(Chemistry, mechanical engineering & Physics
teacher degree in electrical engineering
Graduate & Connecticut Yankee
nuclear engineer 11 years ago & some regard
to position in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory

Very truly yours
Jeff Hess

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Mark Rogers
2210 Pine Hills Court
Jeffersonville, IN 47130

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Your recent letter to President Carter concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this agency for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors have those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

B NRC

2210 Pine Hills Court
at Golfview Estates
Jeffersonville, Indiana 47130

April 4, 1979

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing this letter to inform you of how disappointed the young American people feel towards our elected government and the Board of Directors of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant.

We feel that this near-disaster could have been avoided by taking more interest in the physical construction of this plant. The radiation which was discharged from the plant on March 28, 1979 has endangered the lives of over 131,000 persons. In itself, this is the largest crime of all. The endangerment of the people with nuclear radiation steam has been the most disappointing aspect of the entire situation. Furthermore, what now happens to these innocent people infected with radiation? How is the area around the plant to be cleaned up presuming that there is an area left to clean up!

The N.R.C. has loose rules and regulations in regards to protection of the citizens via the safety measures taken in constructing a plant of this type. These safety regulations are of great personal interest to me because our government is constructing a similar plant in Madison, Indiana - less than 31 miles from my home. If we should be allowed to continue construction of this plant, the N.R.C. should strengthen the rules and regulations regarding the safety of this proposed plan. If you feel that the government agencies can be prepared for the ever constant threat of a "melt-down" of one of these nuclear plants, then leave your rules stand as they are written. If it is allowed, could you please send me a copy of the N.R.C.'s rules on the matter.

I strongly feel that I have a very great responsibility in this argument. I want to live my life to its fullest and not have to worry about such things as this! I cannot see the point in standing idle and possibly watching a city or cities die because os some peoples' stubbornness. I do not want to see our area contaminated by nuclear radiation. I believe this is my generation's United States coming up and I want it to be freed from constant worries about such horrors. Also, I want to see my children's children free from this grave concern. My constituents and I feel we should have the larger part of the decision on the question of nuclear safety and the construction of the nuclear plants. If you and your colleagues intend to possibly poison our society and environment, I fully intend to pursue every way available to me, including legal means, to see that this does not occur. The entire problem lies in the N.R.C.'s lax rules and regulations concerning nuclear power plants. If these rules are corrected by being made <u>much</u> more stringent, nuclear plants could be made quite safe. The engineers claim that these reactors are safe, but obviously they are not, as witnessed by this colossal mistake.

The United States further claims to have the best record of nuclear safety. How can the N.R.C. now claim this after this accident? After all, there has never been a nuclear accident that we know of ....!? That brings me to another point of interest, that is, the question of how many other types of "accidents" have occurred but have been covered up. The cover-ups that are evident, at least the ones that have surfaced, cause us to wonder how many of these related cover-ups have occurred. I feel that many already have, however, this is only an opinion. I feel there are matters of integrity involved here. If you intend to change these, then more power to you; however, if you chose not to rectify these situations, then an accident, that is to say, a "melt-down" would be in your hands and the hands of any others who had a part in that decision. I feel confident that you will make the right decision concerning this matter. I feel that if there had been a "melt-down," you would have been only partially responsible, but after this recent occurrence, it will

then be on your conscience.

The main conflict, again, is the people of the N.R.C. This group spent only four days inspecting over seven other plants last year. Again, to the point of the questions, what are you, as the leader of our country, going to do about this entire horrifying matter? You are an educated man in the aspects of nuclear radiation and can certainly understand the dire needs of our American communities. If you and the Congress do nothing concerning this life and death matter, you will, in essence, be condemning the American people to certain death. This may not occur to this extreme during my lifetime nor my children's lifetime, but what about our descendants? What should they be led to believe about their ancestors and the type of government officials leading the United States of America during this period of time.

I am asking you, as a last cry for help before the BIG mistake is made, which is inevitable and possibly can be totally avoided, to promptly submit your motion to the N.R.C. to get their rules and regulations "stiffened up" or, again, there will definitely be a great accident which may cost the lives of thousands, or perhaps, even millions!

I will expect a reply directly from your office concerning this very grave matter. I can be reached at Jeffersonville High School anytime between 8:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M., E.S.T. I will be anxiously awaiting your reply.

Sincerely,

Mark Rogers

Mark Rogers

School - 812/282-6601
Home - 812/288-7561

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Dale J. Seidel
19 University Park Apts.
Amherst, MA 01002

Dear Mr. Seidel:

Your recent letter to President Carter concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this agency for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

1.

NRC

Dear Mister President,

When you first began your campaign for the office that you hold and I voted for you to hold, you said that there would be a new era in the White House. It was to be an open White House, and the secrecy of the previous occupant would be replaced by an executive that trusted the American people to be able to know facts and issues. Secrecy was to be banished.

Mister President, I am concerned about what we, the American people are being told about the current crisis at the nuclear plant in Harrisburg, Pa. I have been following it from its beginning, and it seems that we, the people, are not being told the truth, or the people in the A.E.C. are terribly negligent and uninformed about the very thing they are to be experts in. Throughout the crisis, we have been told that there was nothing to be concerned about. But hour after hour, it becomes evident that there is something to be worried and concerned over, or it is evident that those that are being paid high salaries to know about such things know absolutely nothing.

From nothing to worry about, the first day, suddenly pregnant women and pre-school children were asked to leave. Why? If there is nothing to worry about, why, in the United States of America, are we evacuating people? Are we at war? Next, we hear that people are being evacuated up to five miles from the site; but again, spokesmen are saying there is nothing to worry about. This morning, we are told that the governor is mobilizing the National Guard; evacuation has now reached ten miles. Nearly one million people are on the move. Others are being told to stay indoors; but still the same spokesmen are saying there is nothing to be concerned about.

Mister President, I am concerned, and I don't think we are being told the truth, and I don't think it is as open and trustful a White House

as I expected. There is something terribly wrong there, Mr. President. In the United States of America, we are evacuating citizens. Where are they going to, Mr. President? Where are we all going to go if these thi happen all over the country?

It is raining right now here, Mr. President. How much of that safe blow off is falling on me? Where are we going to hide?

I think it is better to shut them down, and take a long hard look the safety and at our experts. I think it is the thing itself, not hum error that we must look at. We don't like them, Mr. President. We do like our babies and mothers, and pre-schoolers being sent away. Let's something about it; NOW!

Very truly yours,

Dale J. Seidel

Dale J. Seidel

Brian K. Ikson

Cynthia Tkach

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Charles W. Keyser, Jr.
826 Oberlin Road
Middletown, PA 17057

Dear Mr. Keyser:

Your recent letter to Chairman Hendrie concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this office for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

June 26, 1979

Dear Mr. Hendrie:

We the people of Middletown want Three Mile Islands license revoked. Met Ed is not competent to run a nuclear power plant safely. They have lied to us over and over again and we will not stand by and let them reopen this disaster area. We want it closed and will continue to fight to keep it closed.

There are so many unanswered questions. What about the contaminated water in the containment building?

They are talking about starting Unit 1 when they found cracked pipes. I cannot believe they can even suggest starting Unit 1 when they do not have the problems with Unit 2 solved.

It was quite a terrible experience that we had to go through, and we do not want to go through it again. My family and I were apart for eleven days.

Please help us make this an area that must only cope with Nature's dilemmas & not this unknown monster that lies in our midst.

Charles W Keyser Jr
826 Berlin Rd.
Middletown, Pa
17057

Debra K. Keyser

Cracks Discoverd In Cooling Pipes In Three Mile Island Unit 1

Cracks in a 10-inch stainless steel pipe which would move water to the Unit I reactor core in an emergency were discovered by Three Mile Island station personnel Wednesday, June 20, during a follow-up examination of a number of piping systems.

Met-Ed wants to start operating Unit 1 in August!

A small amount of water was leaking through the hairline crack.

An ultrasonic examination of the pipe determined that the cracks were in the heat affected zone adjacent to the pipe weld and were estimated to extend over a total of six inches of the circumference of the pipe.

Unit 1 is fueled—and contaminated radioactive water from Unit 2 was also reported to be leaking into cooling water of Unit 1 over a month ago.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Robert S. Foster
23 Grinnel Drive
Cedar Cliff Manor
Camp Hill, PA 17011

Dear Mr. Foster:

Your recent letter to Chairman Hendrie concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this office for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

23 Bonnie Brae
Camp Hill Pa 17011
June 5, 1979

Mr. Joseph M. Hendrie, Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Hendrie,

I am writing to you concerning the "accident" at T.M.I. and the operation of nuclear plants in general. I am very concerned of the future of our family as well as fellow citizens of Pennsylvania and the United States.

After attending Hearings, Educational Seminars and Meetings concerned about T.M.I. as well as reading articles, I have become very annoyed and indeed angry at some of the lack of Solid Data that should be information readily available to the public industry the safe level of exposure Vs the amount of actual exposure. Not the short term or long term effects of exposure to "normal" as well as "abnormal" emissions. There is no information as to the chemical content of the "steam" emitted from the Cooling Towers and it's effects if any. Problems of animals dying to have their fur fade or excessive ignorance. I get particularly annoyed when someone of authority attempts to educate the public of the Nuclear Industry by pointing out that no one was injured or killed because of T.M.I. (Only time will answer this!) and then attempts to parallel that with the Highway Accident Record of the country!

If Nuclear Power Plants are so safe, why the need of the Price-Anderson Act? What other industry or business has that kind of protection against liability and negligence? Also there is the very important problem of what disposal of Nuclear waste materials which is very dangerous must be resolved the problem of T.M.I. These materials are dangerous for thousands of years.

surely, the economical is nuclear power worth considering the consequences of a meltdown possible placement, or the lives of thousands of people, and the future of generations to come? What the true cost of Research, Development, Fuel Processing, Decommissioning, and of course all of the present subsidized taxes? It is for a small percentage of the total Electrical power used appears to be very expensive - in fact too expensive!!

The above concerns, along with the information concerning the disposable conditions of the Uranium mines and the lack of Health Safety indicate that the whole aspect of Nuclear Power needs a complete re-evaluation. It is still in the experimental stages and as such has no place in Public Utility, but belongs in an experimental setting where the safety, lives and future of U.S. Citizens will not be jeopardized. It surely does appear that the "experts" and the "authority" have been more concerned about the availability of nuclear by products than the future health and welfare of the general public.

I, therefore request that TMI remain closed and that all Nuclear Power as we know it today be phased to "shut down" until there are positive answers backed up by positive responsibility.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Foltz

(Robert S. Foltz)

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Francis Mitchell Carson
608 Montgomery Road
Ambler, PA 19002

Dear Mr. Carson:

Your recent letter to Chairman Hendrie concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this office for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FRANCIS MITCHELL CARSON
608 MONTGOMERY ROAD
AMBLER, PA. 19002

June 28, 1979

The Honorable Richard Thornburgh
State Capitol
Harrisburg, Pa. 17120

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR PLANT

Dear Sir,

First, let me say that I supported you in your campaign to become Governor of Pennsylvania in the recent election and second, let me make it clear that I do not own any stock, nor have I any financial interest, in the General Public Utilities, or any of its subsidiaries.

But I was dismayed to read in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin of June 24, 1979 that you were opposed to resumption of service of UNIT #1 at Three Mile Island Plant. To replace the Power generated by both TMI Units with oil-fired generating equipment would require something close to ELEVEN MILLION BARRELS OF (IMPORTED) OIL PER YEAR! So keeping UNIT 1 out of service when it's ready to go, would require about half that.

Given the critical oil situation we are faced with, I personally do not feel we can afford the "luxury" of not operating this key nuclear generating unit. In my opinion, the furore, sensationalism and emotionalism generated by the Media over the TMI incident was so grossly over- exaggerated that it bordered on the criminal! Let's count up the score now: NO ONE WAS HURT and THERE WAS NO EXCESSIVE RELEASE OF RADIATION during the TMI Incident. Look further at the record of Nuclear Power Generation: there have been no casualties. Consider, for instance, that Commonwealth Edison, in Chicago, which supplies power to most of Northeastern Illinois, generated 47% of its power last year with Nuclear Units. Ask them what their costs and problems (with nuclear power) have been - their costs have been the lowest and their problems have been minimal and certainly manageable.

We live in troubled times. We no longer can satisfy everybody's whim and fancy and we've got to learn that. But if we don't somehow decrease our dependence on imported oil, we can very easily develop a situation here in this country that will make the Three Mile Island Incident look like a Sunday School Picnic. Just look what's been happening around the country recently, because of a little inconvenience caused by gasoline shortages; look what happened over at Bristol and Levittown last Sunday.

We should operate all our Nuclear units; we should complete those under construction and put them into service promptly; we should take every opportunity to save oil, wherever and whenever possible. We have got

to assume some types of risks, to avoid the still greater risk of economic disaster that could result from a drastically curtailed oil supply.

And I still insist that the risks of operating nuclear power plants is not great at all: it is minimal - look at the record.

Very truly yours,

Francis M. Carson

FMC/jc

Attach.

CC: Jimmy Carter
R. Lawrence Coughlin
H. John Heinz III
Richard S. Schweiker
Vernon Pyles
Edwin Holl
W. Wilson Goode

Hostile Reception

Local Opposition Halts Oil-Refinery Projects Along the East Coast

Some Gas Shortages Traced To Limits on Refineries; Oilmen Are Frustrated

'Everybody Can Say No'

By Douglas Martin

Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

PORTSMOUTH, Va.—John K. Evans, a transplanted Welshman, claims he knows one good reason why gasoline supplies are so tight along the East Coast: There simply aren't enough refineries to turn crude oil into gasoline. Mr. Evans says it makes him downright angry to realize that the last major East Coast refinery was built in 1957.

The 72-year-old oil-business promoter is an expert on the subject because for the past 14 years he has been roaming from Maine to Georgia trying to build a large refinery. His latest attempt, which has been going on since 1974, is to build a large, modern refinery on the west bank of the Elizabeth River here. He hasn't succeeded, and neither has anyone else, despite more than 30 separate attempts in the past 20 years.

The reason for the failures, a government study of 24 failed attempts concluded: People don't want a large refinery in their backyards and they have become skilled at enlisting government red tape to turn back promoters' efforts. "You can never build a refinery if the people in a local community object," says Donald O'Hara, president of the National Petroleum Refiners Association says. "We have reached the stage of participatory democracy where almost everyone in the society can say 'no' but no one can say 'yes.'" complains Energy Secretary James Schlesinger.

The "No's" Have It

The voicing of too many "no's" is finally catching up with energy consumers in the East. The East Coast gobbles up a third of all petroleum products consumed in the U.S., but only refines a quarter of its needs. The rest has to be brought in by tankers from overseas and by pipeline and barges from refineries in Texas and on the Gulf Coast, where the industry's major expansion has been concentrated. This not only increases consumer's costs but also adds to distribution problems.

The fuel shortage is likely to worsen in the East. An Energy Department study estimates that the East Coast needs five to 10 major new refineries by 1985. "We cannot overcome the seriousness of the needs" Deputy Energy Secretary John O'Leary says.

There are just 19 large refineries along the East Coast from Maine to Florida. But the actual capacity is less than this because only 11 can make gasoline, and one of these has been closed down for environmental reasons. These plants are running at approximately the national average capacity of 94.5%, but the Energy Department wants this raised to 97%, and others want it raised even higher. The oil companies say they are processing as much oil as they can prudently take out of their inventories. But the Energy Department is pressing them to reduce their inventories faster to increase the use of available capacity and thus produce more fuels.

Short-Sightedness

Not all of the Eastern refineries producing gasoline can also refine the higher grades of unleaded gasoline, and not all of the Eastern refineries can produce low-sulphur heating oil. This is creating a tight market for two products increasingly in demand.

Opposition and red tape aren't the only reasons for the small number of plants: Government shortsightedness can also be blamed. Although the government limited imports of crude oil throughout the 1960s, it placed minimal restrictions on imports of "residual" oil for generating plants, which adequately supplemented the residual oil being produced by the Eastern refineries. It made sense to import as much as possible because the foreign product was cheaper than the domestically refined oil. All that, of course, ended with the Arab oil embargo that began in 1973 and the subsequent price increases. But until then it hadn't appeared justifiable to build new refineries on the East Coast, with the exception of a few small plants that can only produce residual oil.

Problems With Eagles

Now Washington is trying to catch up, and a top-level task force is reviewing a range of possible measures to promote refinery investment, including protective tariffs. In addition, a group of senators from the Northeast and from oil-producing states is calling for a broad program of incentives.

Even today not everyone agrees on the need for new refineries. Government projections show the percentage of oil consumed in the U.S. that is also refined in this country increasing by three percentage points—to 91.8%—over the five years ending in 1981. Some oil-industry people say that these figures show that there is no impending crisis and that the U.S. has adequate refining capacity, even if it isn't all in the most ideal locations. They note that it costs about one billion dollars to build a big refinery from scratch. "How do you compete against such a plant that's already paid for? That's the real problem," one oilman says.

But other oil-industry people believe that the impending shortfall of refining capacity is very real, and promoters are struggling up and down the East Coast to build new refineries. Pittston Co. has been trying to build a 250,000-barrel-a-day refinery in Eastport, Me., since 1973, but the project has been stalled by government worries about the plant's effect on bald eagles and whales. "We seem hopelessly hung up with bureaucracy," sighs Pittston vice president Arthur

Please Turn to Page 32, Column 4

Continued From First Page

Xanakis. In the meantime, he says, the cost of the project has more than doubled to $750 million.

Usually, companies give up in despair. Crown Central Petroleum Co. fought fierce opposition to a proposed refinery in Baltimore harbor for more than five years before dropping the idea. Now the company has proposed building a refinery near Wilmington, N.C., but already an opposition group has sprung up.

Mr. Evans, the promoter who opened this story, is determined to hang on in his effort to build a 175,000-barrel-a-day refinery at Portsmouth, Va. He has bruises to show for his previous efforts. He struggled for almost four years to put up a refinery on the banks of Virginia's Nansemond River, but he was defeated by environmentalists who objected to plans for an undersea pipeline running into the plant. And in the mid-1960s he tried, unsuccessfully, to build refineries in Maine, Rhode Island and Georgia.

But he did succeed in building a refinery near Waikiki Beach, Hawaii, in 1971. It has been his sole successful refining venture to date.

Mr. Evans is a burly, mustachioed man who left his home in Wales at the age of 14 and spent several years at sea. He worked for over 20 years for Royal Dutch Shell, and for nearly two decades he has traveled the world promoting various oil-business ventures.

His job is to seek out investors to back projects ("I've had a number of very rich friends," he says with a wink). For the proposed Portsmouth refinery he was able to attract Cox Enterprises Inc., a privately held publishing company that is trying to diversify. But as the opposition has dragged on, Cox has spent more than $6 million without seeing a girder being put into place. Mr. Evans, who has poured in $500,000 of his own money, laments that "we've got lawyers coming out of our ears."

When Mr. Evans first had the idea for the plant in 1971, the cost was estimated at $100 million. By 1973 it had reached $250 million. Now the cost has soared to $650 million.

The sour, stalemated history of Mr. Evans' refinery, named the Hampton Roads Energy Co. after the deep, harbor it would overlook, can be largely explained by local opposition. An opposition group called CARE (for Citizens Against Refinery Effects) has gathered the signatures of 13,000 local people who oppose the refinery.

The refinery's opponents make a number of arguments, not the least of which is that the area, with over a million people, has a high incidence of certain types of cancer. Three local medical societies contend that the cancer rate could be increased by emissions from the refinery.

Then there are economic arguments based on the devastating effect that a tanker oil spill could have on the area's seafood industry. "Wherever refineries have been located, we've lost our oysters," says Chrystra Morgan, the owner of a seafood-processing company. An oil spill also could harm tourism, another major source of local revenue. "We depend entirely on the clean beaches and clean air," says Michael Savvides, a restaurateur in the area.

But there also are residents who believe that the refinery would aid the faltering economy of the area. Supporters speak of the 50% increase in local real-estate taxes the refinery would provide, as well as the 400 jobs that Mr. Evans has promised. "The opposition is mainly composed of free-loving hippies and wealthy elitists," railed a recent editorial in the Virginia Observer, a local labor newspaper.

Decision From the Army

Now the bitter fight shows signs of entering a new stage. The chief engineer of the Army Corps of Engineers, which is responsible for gathering evidence of the project's worth, has recommended that the plant be built. The Secretary of the Army has promised a final decision by the end of July. But Joanne Berkley, a leader of Care, says the opposition group will probably file suit against a favorable decision. National environmental groups are offering CARE their financial support.

Hampton Roads Energy also has been forced to contend with a bewildering number of environmental regulations, including rules governing atmospheric emissions, hazardous-waste disposal and water pollution. "This is a horrible time in the history of environmental laws to try to get permits," says George Pence of the Philadelphia office of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Although the EPA has granted virtually every permit that Hampton Roads Energy has requested, the agency has recommended that the Secretary of the Army kill the project. Officials say that although the company was able to prove that it would provide adequate controls, the agency believes the overall ecological effect could be disastrous. "You're mortgaging the future of the area," says one agency official.

To come this far, the leaders of CARE have attended more than 20 federal, state hearings, have produced hundreds of pages of written comment and have brought several lawsuits. "We've been called terribly clever," says Mrs. Berkley. "What we're clever for is understanding the system."

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Ms. Eunice J. Burkett
801 Walnut Street
Apartment 12
Lemoyne, PA 17043

Dear Ms. Burkett:

Your recent letter to Chairman Hendrie concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power was referred to this office for response. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Eunice J. Burkett
801 Walnut Street
Apartment 12
Lemoyne, Penna. 17043

June 28, 1979

Joseph M. Hendrie, Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Hendrie:

Pennsylvania has been a state very open toward nuclear power plants/nuclear energy. We have at least six completely constructed nuclear power plants and at least four nuclear power plants being constructed.

We need more measuring devices for measuring radiation levels given off from nuclear power plants not just a few near its sites. The Three Mile Island accident has shown that wind carries various radioactive particles many miles away from the site. The monitoring devices themselves need improvement since many give inaccurate information as shown during the Three Mile Island crisis.

The Peachbottom Nuclear Power Plant is having problems. As of Thursday, June 21, 1979 around 5:00 o'clock P.M. 6% above the normal radiation standard of emmissions was released from the Peachbottom Plant and 16% on Friday, June 22, 1979 around 5:00 o'clock A.M. The aforementioned is an example of why better and more monitoring devices are needed. Nuclear power plants are unsafe and constantly suffer from various problems which lead to high radioactive emmissions from the plants. The public should know what and how much they are being exposed to.

Another concern with regard to Three Mile Island is the water in the containment building. Will that water be judged purified and dumped into the Susquehanna River? You must not allow this to happen -- Tritum can never be removed from the water.

Very truly yours,

Eunice J. Burkett

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Mr. Chris Fisher
334-D Willowbrook Dr.
Norrstown, PA 19401

Dear Mr. Fisher:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Dear Sirs

[illegible] the [illegible] about the radiation leaks in the power plants how could this happen [illegible]

[illegible] are [illegible]

[illegible] times such a [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] That [illegible]

[illegible] prevent [illegible]

Christ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 19[illegible]

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SEP 14 1979

Ms. Rhonda Centimole
379 Rt. 9
Bayville, NJ 08721

Dear Ms. Centimole:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning the accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 expressing your views on nuclear power. We appreciate your concerns and assure you that every effort is being made to ensure the continued protection of the health and safety of the public not only at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, but also at all nuclear power plants.

We have taken or are taking a number of actions with respect to all nuclear power plants as a result of the Three Mile Island accident. Specifically, full-time inspectors have been assigned to each operating plant utilizing Babcock & Wilcox pressurized water reactors like those at Three Mile Island. In addition, the licensees of all these plants which were not already shut down have voluntarily shut down their plants. We have issued confirmatory orders to the licensees of all Babcock & Wilcox reactors like those at Three Mile Island to assure that necessary plant modifications, additional training and revised operating procedures will be effected prior to resuming operation.

Licensees of all operating plants utilizing pressurized water reactors have been instructed to take specific actions with regard to the status of certain equipment, plant procedures, operator actions and facility designs. Licensees of all operating plants, including those utilizing boiling water reactors, have been instructed to provide us with additional information with regard to their facilities in light of the Three Mile Island accident. In addition, substantial effort is being expended within this agency to evaluate the factors which contributed to the Three Mile Island accident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

We will carefully review all the information obtained and developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accident and take whatever further action is deemed appropriate.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Denton

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation