
In the Matter of an Arbitration

between

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL
WORKERS, LOCAL UNION No. 1243,

Complainant,

and

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,

Respondent,

Involving Arbitration Case No. 35.

OPINION AND DECISION OF BOARD OF ARBITRATION

SAM KAGEL, Chairman

LAWRENCE H. FOSS, Union Member

J. J. WILDER, Union Member

J. WAYLAND DOWBRIGHT, Employer Member

ARTHUR M. KEEZER, Employer Member

San Francisco, California

April 2, 1971

EXHIBIT M

ISSUE:

"Whether the discharge of Forrest E. Williams, Jr. was in violation of the Labor Agreement dated September 1, 1952, as last amended?"

Mr. Williams was employed on October 8, 1962, and discharged on May 25, 1970. He was a Control Technician.

LETTER OF DISCHARGE:

The Company's Division Manager sent the following letter to Williams on May 27, 1970:

"This letter confirms the telephone notification which you received on May 26, 1970, from Mr. R. H. Taylor, Division Personnel Manager, that you were discharged effective 12:00 P.M. that date for insubordination when considered in the light of other acts of misconduct on your part.

"Specifically, your discharge was triggered by your latest act of misconduct, namely your refusal to accept a work assignment to Chemistry from your supervisor in the morning of May 25, 1970.

"On the afternoon of May 15, 1970, while you were on disciplinary layoff without pay for a previous act of insubordination for refusal to perform certain work assignments in Chemistry on May 11, you informed the Company that you agreed to perform these work assignments without qualification. You were, therefore, reinstated on May 18, 1970. On your return to work that date you were not assigned to Chemistry work, at your request, because you reported that you had an open wound resulting from the surgical removal of a growth from the middle finger of your left hand. You were not assigned to Chemistry work during the week of May 18-22.

"On May 25, your wound was inspected by Mr. E. D. Weeks, Senior Plant Engineer, who determined that it had sufficiently healed and could be effectively sealed so that you could be assigned to the Chemistry Section of Unit 3. Since you disputed the assignment your wound was subsequently inspected by Messrs. W. A. Raymond, Assistant Plant Superintendent, C. E. Allen, Radiation Protection Engineer, and H. Reynolds, Claims and Safety Department, all of whom opined that the wound could be sealed and that there would be no hazard for you to work in the Chemistry area. You refused to accept their opinion that the wound could be sealed and stated that you would not work in Chemistry because it was not worth the risk and that the risk was not warranted under the circumstances.

"In the presence of two Shop Stewards, R. McKenna and V. Teague, it was explained to you that the assignment was considered safe and why, the reasons for the assignment, and the possible consequences for your action. You continued to refuse the assignment and were suspended from work without pay at 0945, pending review and investigation.

"On May 26, you were called in, with pay for additional investigation from 1000 to 1200, and subsequently notified of the termination of your employment.

"Relative to the reasons for your discharge, as noted above, some weight was given to your past record of misconduct, particularly during the past two weeks. For example, on three previous occasions you were reprimanded in writing, and disciplined for acts of insubordination, noted as follows:

"1. Letter to you from Mr. E. D. Weeks, dated May 8, 1968, re leaving your work area to talk to a shop steward without having requested or received permission from your supervisor to do so.

"2. Letter to you from Mr. E. D. Weeks dated March 9, 1970, re disciplinary lay-off of 9 hours without pay for insubordination.

"3. Letter to you from Mr. D. L. Wain dated May 13, 1970 re disciplinary lay-off of 30 hours without pay for insubordination." (Co. Ex. 13.)

DISCUSSION:

General Situation:

As a Control Technician, Williams was involved in the sampling of reactor water and offgas for radiation level testing at the Company's Nuclear Power Plant in Humboldt County, California. On May 11, 1970, Williams refused to perform the collection and processing of offgas samples, reactor water samples, and other waste samples. This refusal occurred on May 11, 1970, at which time he told his immediate supervisor that he "refused to perform these assignments, because in [his] opinion, they were 'unsafe' and that 'this chronic exposure to radiation was unnecessary, and wrong.'"

Company supervision informed him that it considers such jobs to be safe, but Williams refused again to perform the work. Williams was subsequently placed on three days' disciplinary suspension subject to the following provision:

"If by the end of this period you agree to perform subject work assignments without qualification you will be reinstated as of 0800, May 15, 1970, and the period of your suspension will be recorded as disciplinary layoff without pay. If you do not so agree by the end of this period you will be considered as discharged as of 1630, May 15, 1970." (Co. Ex. 11.)

Williams did not file a grievance concerning this suspension and it was not challenged during Williams' discharge case by the Union. (Union Brief p. 3.)

On his return to work on May 18, Williams pointed out that he had a growth removed from the end of his finger which had not yet healed. According to the Company, he could have been assigned to Chemistry on his return to work if normal precautions had been taken but that the Company chose not to assign him to such work because it wanted "to avoid another flak up...." (Tr. p. 60.)

A decision was made that when Williams' wound had healed more completely, he would then be assigned to Chemistry.

On May 25, according to the Company, the wound had had seven days to heal. Additionally, in terms of quarterly exposure to radiation that the Control Technicians had to date, Williams had the least. A decision was made that Williams would perform Chemistry work after his finger was sealed. The method of sealing was to avoid direct contamination by radioactive water through the use of a "finger-cot" cut from a rubber glove sealed with watertight tape, and a plastic surgeon's glove sealed at the wrist with watertight tape topped by a rubber glove. (Co. Ex. 8.)

Williams then refused to perform the work in question.

Williams' Testimony:

According to Williams, on May 25, his finger was still bandaged. When examined by the Company, Williams pointed out that the wound was still draining and sore. He squeezed his finger and according to Williams, "a little bulb appeared on it of lymph." (Tr. p. 113.) According to the Company testimony Williams squeezed hard, but nothing came out of the wound.

Williams asked for a couple of more days so that the wound could be completely healed which was refused. (Tr.p.113.)

Rafelson's Report:

The next day Williams reported to a doctor at Company request who found that the wound was practically healed and that in his opinion, although he had no familiarity with radiation and consulted with the radiologist concerning it, the protection contemplated by the Company would be sufficient to provide protection to the wound.

Williams' physician stated that on May 27 he examined the wound, that it was nearly healed, that 5/10th of a millimeter in area was still open which would heal in two days. (Tr.p. 220.)

Williams' Defense:

The Union contends that the Company's ordering Williams to work in Chemistry was in direct violation of the Company's

our safety rules; that as a matter of fact the wound could not be effectively sealed in any event; that the reasons assigned for the discharge of Williams were not as stated in Company Exhibit 13, the Letter of Discharge.

SUMMARY:

Company Safety Rules:

The Company's Radiation Control Standard contains the following:

Standard

"II. Controlled Area Injuries

- "B. Persons having skin breaks shall not be allowed to enter a Controlled Area without the approval of Radiation Protection and/or their immediate supervisor.

Medical

"II. Controlled Area Injuries

- "B. Approval for Persons Having Skin Breaks to Perform Radiation Work

- "1. The assignment of persons having skin breaks to work in radioactive materials areas should be avoided if possible.

- "2. Each person shall be responsible for notifying his supervisor of any skin breaks which he may have before performing radiation work. The supervisor shall be responsible for insuring that any skin breaks are adequately protected before permitting the injured person to enter the Controlled Area. 'Skin Breaks' shall include unhealed wounds, open cracks from chapping, and other injuries such as

lacerations, abrasions, punctures, blisters, or burns.

"3. Persons having skin breaks shall perform radiation work only after the specific prior approval of the individual's supervisor and/or Radiation Protection. The individual's supervisor and/or Radiation Protection shall assure that the degree of protection afforded the skin break is adequate in view of the nature of the work to be performed by the injured person.

"4. The approval to perform the Radioactive Material Area work is contingent upon the protection afforded the wound remaining in satisfactory condition. The individual is expected to make every effort to maintain the dressing in place during the course of the work and to leave the work immediately if the degree of protection afforded the wound becomes inadequate." (Co: In. 2.)

Conclusions as to Radiation Control Regulations:

The Union relies on paragraph II B(1) on the basis that the assignment of Williams could have been avoided, in that another Control Technician was available for such work as was admitted by the Company. (Tr. p. 16.)

The Company's reason for the assignment of Williams was that his radiation exposure was less than that of other personnel and the Company felt, that Williams' wound had healed or if it had not, it could be properly protected. The Company regulations do not prohibit persons with skin breaks working in radioactive areas, but they direct that this be avoided if possible and that in the event an employee is to work in such

an area with a skin break, the individual Supervisor or Radiation Protection is to insure that proper radiation protection procedures are followed. In this case, Williams' wound had had seven days to heal, a reasonable determination was made that the wound had healed to the point that either it was no longer a skin break or, if Williams' testimony is credited, it had healed to the point where it could reasonably have been protected from direct contact with contaminated water by a waterproof covering. Accordingly, under the state of the facts presented, the Company by its actions on May 25 directing Williams to work in Chemistry did not violate the provisions of the Safety Regulations.

Adequacy of Protection Methods:

Williams maintains that the protection to be provided was inadequate to protect his finger from radioactive water contamination because the procedures involved require the emerging of his hand in contaminated water. Williams testified that if a small leak occurred in the glove, this might not be known to him because of the normal sweat of his hand. Water could also come in over the top of the glove. (Tr. p. 122.) In the past, he has cut his gloves on the scotch tape dispenser cutter which is used and glassware breaks during the normal washing procedure. (Tr. pp. 123-124.)

Williams admitted that he did not cut his glove too often during his work on the job and admitted that if glass breaks, that a skin break could occur because of the broken glass.

The Company stated that the protection that it afforded Williams was the normal protection afforded for skin breaks in the industry, and at the Company's nuclear plant.

Conclusions Concerning Adequacy of Protection:

The risk that Williams was concerned with was contact between his wound and water. The protection offered by the Company consisted of three layers of waterproofing, two which were sealed. Williams admits that he is required to be careful in terms of the work that he performs. Under the circumstances, the protection that the Company afforded Williams seems adequate to have protected him from contact with water. As the Company points out, in the event that the three layers protection were cut, there would also be a probability that an independent cut or break would occur in the skin because of the cause of the cutting of the waterproof protection. Such would be an independent source of contamination which is part of the normal risks inherent in the Control Technician job. Therefore, as a matter of fact, it is found that the protection offered Williams was adequate in view of the nature of the work he was to perform. (See Reg. II B(3), Co. Ex. 9.)

Reasons for Discharge:

The Company raised the issue that there was a common plan and design on the part of Williams and Robert Rowan (see Arbitration Case 36) and others who continually raised questions concerning the adequacy and efficacy of the Company's safety program.

At the Company's safety meeting of May 20, 1970, Williams raised questions concerning the too high seating of the background reading of the hand and foot counter for accurate monitoring of persons leaving the control area as well as questions concerning the maintenance of the high level solid waste storage vault in terms of possibility of spreading undetected contamination. (Co. Ex. 1.) Other matters raised by Williams include that personnel were not receiving instruction in radiation monitoring. (Co. Ex. 2.) According to the Union, these questions were questions which caused embarrassment to the Company and that this was the real reason why Williams was discharged, and that the incident on May 25 provided a convenient way for the Company to rid itself of Williams.

The Company states that Williams' participation in the safety meeting of May 20 received but very minor weight, if any, in the decision to discharge, and the primary reasons for Williams discharge were stated in the letter of discharge that was sent to Williams. (Tr. p. 101.)

Conclusions Concerning Basis for Discharge:

In summary there is no question that the record discloses that Williams and, as will be stated later, Rowan, decided to bring radiation safety questions into the open at safety meetings. In the past, the record shows the Company has adopted safety suggestions of its employees including such questions in the radiation field. What the record does disclose, insofar as Williams is concerned, is that the Company's motivation for discharge was as stated in the Letter of Discharge to Williams and the additional consideration that it desired to check on his good faith statement that he had returned to work after the May 12 suspension without qualification. (Tr.p.107.) Whatever Williams' motivation for his actions on May 11 and May 25, the record does not sustain his claims that the Company was motivated and had acted against him because of the questions raised by him at the May 20 safety meeting.

Mitigation:

The record does show that Williams raised the question of safety on May 25, and at that time the Company took justifiable action concerning the protection of Williams' skin break. The Company was entitled to order him to work in Chemistry based on the amount of radiation exposure that all of the Control Technicians had had.

However, Williams did make the statement that in a couple of more days had passed and he would have unqualifiedly returned to work in Chemistry. As the above shows, Williams was not entitled to ask for those "couple of more days." Nonetheless, the record does show that Williams was employed for eight years, and that except for the incidents occurring in May 1970 and a relatively minor infraction on May 6, 1968, he apparently had a good work record. Williams has been off work since May 1970. Reducing his discharge to a suspension without back pay provides ample and significant discipline for his refusal to perform work on May 25.

DECISION IN ARBITRATION CASE NO. 35:

1. Forrest G. Williams, Jr. will be returned to work forthwith in line with his seniority.
2. He shall receive no back pay.

BOARD OF ARBITRATION:

<u>Sam Hall</u>		
Chairman		
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>9-30-71</u>
Union Member	Concur/Dissent	Date
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	
Union Member	Concur/Dissent	Date
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>Dissent</u>	<u>3/30/71</u>
Employer Member	Concur/Dissent	Date
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>4/1/71</u>
Employer Member	Concur/Dissent	Date

FROM SEN. BILL PROXMIRE (WIS.)		DATE OF DOCUMENT 8/26/71	DATE RECEIVED 8/31/71	CONTROL NUMBER 29889																
TO AEC		SUSPENSE DATE 9/8	FILE CODE																	
DESCRIPTION: LTR ☒ Original ☐ Copy ☐ Other		CLASSIFICATION Series: U Copy: _____ of _____	REPLY DATES Acknowledge 8 9/1 Interim _____ Final _____	SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS ☐ Appropriate Handling																
ENCLOSURES ORIG. OF LTR FM ROBERT J. ROSEN, JR., EUREKA, CALIF., CONCERNING THE IRRESPONSIBLE ACTS OF CERTAIN "NUCLEAR MANAGEMENT" - NAMELY THOSE OF THE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO., ET AL		PREPARE FOR SIGNATURE OF: XX AS APPROPRIATE ☐ CHAIRMAN ☐ DIV./OFFICE DIRECTOR ☐ GENERAL MANAGER ☒ XXXXXXXXXX ☐ ASST. GENERAL MANAGER																		
REMARKS:																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>REFERRED TO</th> <th>DATE</th> <th>RECEIVED BY</th> <th>DATE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DIR. OF REG.</td> <td>8/31</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>INTERIM REPLY PREP. BY: KENTLER O'NEILL</td> <td>10/1</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>OGM ADMIN UNIT</td> <td></td> <td>FOR DISPATCH</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					REFERRED TO	DATE	RECEIVED BY	DATE	DIR. OF REG.	8/31			INTERIM REPLY PREP. BY: KENTLER O'NEILL	10/1			OGM ADMIN UNIT		FOR DISPATCH	
REFERRED TO	DATE	RECEIVED BY	DATE																	
DIR. OF REG.	8/31																			
INTERIM REPLY PREP. BY: KENTLER O'NEILL	10/1																			
OGM ADMIN UNIT		FOR DISPATCH																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">INFORMATION COPIES SENT TO:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>☐ CHAIRMAN</td> <td>☐ GENERAL MANAGER</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☒ A OCK R ST.</td> <td>☒ OGC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☐ _____</td> <td>☐ _____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					INFORMATION COPIES SENT TO:		☐ CHAIRMAN	☐ GENERAL MANAGER	☒ A OCK R ST.	☒ OGC	☐ _____	☐ _____								
INFORMATION COPIES SENT TO:																				
☐ CHAIRMAN	☐ GENERAL MANAGER																			
☒ A OCK R ST.	☒ OGC																			
☐ _____	☐ _____																			

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMUNICATIONS CONTROL
U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

FORM HQ-281
(4-68)

April 30, 1971

Director
Division of Licensing and Regulation
USAEC
Washington 25, D.C. 20545

Dear Sir:

During the course of my employment with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and while I was employed as a Nuclear Control Technician, I experienced the inadequacies of the law and procedures pertaining to the control and regulation of nuclear power plants.

It is this matter I desire to bring to your attention. And at the same time, this letter may be considered the initial groundwork of my going on public record concerning these inadequacies.

To begin please allow me to quote from the followings:

Decision of the Referee
California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board
Case Number SF - 1319

Robert J. Rowen, Jr. vs Pacific Gas and Electric Company

STATEMENTS OF FACTS

....."A preponderance of evidence indicate that during the last year or two of the claimant's employment he was involved in many disputes with higher management over his reports of safety violations. The following are cited as examples:

1. The routine work permit under which a group of employees were working in the summer of 1967 permitted exposure of only five to 50 mr's but frequently the exposure was in the area of 2500 mr's.
2. A supervisor ordered a technician to take smears of material to be shipped from the nuclear plant at the top and bottom of the containers but not in the center. This would have the effect of minimizing the radiation count. After the supervisor had been informed the count exceeded the level permitted for such shipments, he asked the claimant to sign a previously prepared shipping document which indicated the radiation level was within tolerable limits. When the claimant refused, he (the supervisor) corrected the shipping

Dupe of
8-20-580591

Rec'd Off. Dir. of Reg.
Date 9/2/71

In conclusion the Referee stated the following:

"The referee concludes the claimant was discharged for reasons other than misconduct connected with his most recent work, within the meaning of sections 1256 and 1030 of the code."

It is noteworthy that the Pacific Gas and Electric Company had its San Francisco attorney representing the company's interest in this matter and that the company had the right to appeal this decision and elected not to do so.

My purpose for presenting these particular facts is to focus your attention on the following problems: (1) I was ordered not to log, for the AEC's inspection, information concerning violations of radiation protection procedures; (2) I was refused permission to talk about these violations with the AEC Compliance Inspector who was in the plant on a routine inspection; (3) Plant management advised me that it was inadvisable for me to go to the AEC about violations concerning radiation protection safety and at the same time management stated that I was placing myself in "serious jeopardy" if I elected to do so; and (4) On or about May 21, 1970, Mr. Burt Jones and Mr. Robert Taylor, both of whom are agents of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company made arrangements with Police Chief Emahiser of the Eureka Police Department to falsify a police record in which the company designed accusatory statements charging four of its seven nuclear control technicians of being members of a group who was participating in, or had the propensity to participate in, various unlawful acts directed at damaging and disrupting the Company's property and services.

In the matter of an arbitration between I.B.E.W., Local 1245, and the Pacific Gas and Electric Company involving arbitration case number 35 dated April 2, 1971, the Arbitrator stated the following in his decision under the section entitled Reasons for Discharge:

"The Company raised the issue that there was a common plan and design on the part of Williams (a nuclear control technician) and Robert Rowen and others who continually raised questions concerning the adequacy and efficacy of the Company's safety program."

In a letter sent to the California Department of Human Resources Development by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, the following statement was made:

"As a Control Technician, Mr. Rowen was required to carry out specific assignments following well defined procedures, in which he had been instructed, under the supervision of an engineer who is an expert in the field of radiation safety. It was not the claimant's responsibility to check on the safety procedures of the Company. He did on numerous occasions make allegations and protest that the Company's actions were unsafe and did not meet Federal requirements. However, he was never able to show how the "unsafe" Company actions failed to meet Federal requirements. The operation of the Humboldt Bay Power Plant, where the claimant was employed, has been inspected by the Atomic Energy Commission at least three to four times a year since the nuclear unit went into operation in 1963, and as a result of these thorough inspections, the Commission has been favorably impressed with our radiation safety program."

It is generally true that the Company looks good on paper as to how well the Humboldt Bay Power Plant operates. It is safe, efficient, and economical or so it seems. I worked in that plant for six years and during the period witnessed events which never became known to the AEC or the public. I also had occasion to meet people from other nuclear facilities and learned from them their philosophies and how their facilities operated.

In the main the responsibility of radiation protection is left to the charge of private industrial management, who I am convinced, is more concerned with the efficient and profitable operation of their plants. In this respect, many plants are not as safe as they are required to be by law. The AEC Compliance Inspectors usually give more than adequate notice before their arriving on the plant's property for its inspection. As part of my job duties, and on many occasions, I would clear up a situation which would clearly result in a citation only because an AEC inspector was coming to inspect the plant. Employees were given directions, usually implicitly but sometimes explicitly, not to talk with AEC inspectors. Notwithstanding the aforementioned, even if employees were given the opportunity to talk with AEC inspectors, the majority of them would fear the reprisals taken later by management. And for these very reasons, employees will not write to the AEC about problems they may be concerned. How efficient and economical a nuclear power plant seems to be on paper is also a question.

For on many occasions I witnessed large sums of labor and materials charged through the accounting process to the conventional fossil fuel plants. However, this is not the main point of this letter.

Returning to the problem of control and regulation of unclear power plants, and in particular the Humboldt Bay Power Plant, I believe an investigation is instore. I believe further that if an investigation of the Humboldt Bay Power Plant was initiated, certain irregularities would be revealed throughout the entire nuclear industry.

You may ask why I have not come forth before now with this information. The answer is simple. I am no longer under the influences and pressure of coercion and threats, and it has become my conviction that these problems which I have briefly mentioned and many more be made publicly known.

The Pacific Gas and Electric Company may undoubtedly accuse me of being a disgruntled ex-employee; however, be that as it may, I feel confident that as I lay out the facts they will withstand the tests of truth.

If you are interested in the information I have and desire to make an inquiry into the nature of these more serious problem, please feel free to contact me. Hopefully, I have been able to present to you rather briefly the severity of the Company's actions earlier mentioned, and more to your particular interest I assume, the underlying reasons why the Pacific Gas and Electric Company chose to exercise these actions.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Rowen, Jr.
Robert J. Rowen, Jr.

2504 "C" Street

Eureka, California 95504

STATEMENT

I, Robert J. Rowen, Jr., make the following free and voluntary statement to John J. Ward, who has identified himself to me as a representative of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. I have been told that I do not have to make a statement, and that any statement I do make may be used in a court of law. No threats or promises have been made to induce me to give this statement, and I have been advised of my right to consult an attorney.

During the time that I was employed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) at the Humboldt Reactor as a nuclear Control Technician, I observed the following:

1. On August 8, 1969, a spent fuel shipping cask was cleared for shipment from the PG&E Humboldt Reactor when it was known by PG&E management to be still contaminated over the limits permitted by the Department of Transportation Regulation 49 CFR 173.397.

2. On August 12, 1969, the stray chamber radiation monitors at three off-site sampling stations in line with the radiation gaseous waste discharge stack went off scale (more than 10mr). I personally read the stray chamber dosimeters and recorded the incident in the Radiation Protection Log book, 62598-71A, dated August 13, 1969. Also my request to review the film pack results was refused by PG&E management.

3. Sometime prior to February 18, 1970, several sections of contaminated 14-inch-diameter piping was cut out of the suppression chamber. This pipe was later sold to the G & R Metals Company of Eureka, apparently without having been properly surveyed. When this matter was brought to their attention, PG&E management refused to produce the special radiation survey forms and the unconditional release papers relating to the pipe, and PG&E management also refused to go to the G & R Company to survey the pipe, after one piece was found to be contaminated.

4. My employment terminated on June 5, 1970. On or about June 15, July 1, and August 1, 1970, I repeatedly asked company management to furnish me a report on my exposure to radiation during my employment. I later received this report from the company. It was dated September 20, 1970.

THE AFOREMENTIONED DOES NOT LIMIT, EITHER BY EXPRESSION OR THROUGH IMPLICATION, THE NATURE OF MY COMPLAINT TO THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION -- THAT ITEMS (1-4) CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DETERMINED MATERIAL SOLELY BY THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION. I have read this statement. It is the truth to

FROM: Sen. Bill Proxmire (Wis.)		CONTROL NUMBER 3678	LOCATION
TO:		DATE OF DOCUMENT 8/26/71	ACTION COMPLETION DEADLINE
AEC		ACTION PROCESSING DATES Acknowledged _____ Interim Report _____ Final _____	PREPARE FOR SIGNATURE OF: _____ Chairman X _____ Director of Regulation
DESCRIPTION Ltr ☒ Original ☐ Copy ☐ Other		REMARKS	
Encl ltr fm Robert J. Rowen, Jr., Eureka, Calif., concerning alleged violations by Pacific Gas and Electric Co. at the Humboldt Bay Plant		Envelope only to be marked ATTN: HH	
Encls: Cys of corres with AEC, DOT, EPA & Environmental Defense Fund of N. Y. 29889			
REFERRED TO	DATE	IS NOTIFICATION TO THE JCAE RECOMMENDED?	
Low f/action	9/3/71		
Cys: Henderson Shapar			

1 4388

DO NOT DETACH THIS COPY

DIRECTOR OF REGULATION
COMMUNICATIONS CONTROLForm HQ-32 (6-70)
USA EC

DATE OF DOCUMENT: 9-3-71		DATE RECEIVED 9-3-71		NO.: 14388	
LTR: ☒		MEMO: ☒		REPORT: ☐	
OTHER: ☐		ORIG.: ☒		CC: ☐	
ACTION NECESSARY ☐		CONCURRENCE ☐		DATE ANSWERED:	
NO ACTION NECESSARY ☐		COMMENT ☐		BY:	
CLASSIFI:		POST OFFICE		FILE CODE:	
U		REG. NO:			
DESCRIPTION: (Must Be Unclassified)		REFERRED TO	DATE	RECEIVED BY	DATE
91-153 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO. (HUMBOLDT BAY PLANT) MEMO RE: ENCL LTR FM ROBERT J. ROWEN, JR., EUREKA, CALIF. CONCERNING ALLEGED VIOLATIONS BY PG&E CO. AT THE HUMBOLDT BAY PLANT.		Engelhardt	9/15/71	H. L. ...	
ENCLOSURES:		Kagawa		Play + ...	
CYS OF CORRES WITH AEC, DOT, EPA & ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND OF NY.		Nelson		...	
REMARKS:					

August 6, 1971

PH

Senator William Proxmire
U.S. Senate Building
Washington D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Proxmire:

Please allow me this opportunity to bring to your attention a matter of vital concern which I choose to call the irresponsible acts of certain "nuclear management" - namely those of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, an unidentified radioactive spent fuel reprocessing firm located in New York, the Department of Transportation's Office of Hazardous Materials, and possibly the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Each of these private firms or governmental agencies have been named for a variety of reasons, some of which are interrelated; however, most of what I have to say relates specifically to the Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

I have a great deal of information I desire to convey to the regulatory policy makers of the nuclear industry, and I would appreciate your advice as to how I could be most successful in this endeavor. Also I believe a Congressional investigation of the nuclear industry is instore.

You will find enclosed a twenty-one page packet of materials which I selected in an attempt to briefly relate to you a portion of my rather complicated story. Included in these materials are the following

- (1) Five page letter to the Director of the U.S.A.E.C.
- (2) A copy of the statement the AEC asked me to sign.
- (3) A copy of a letter sent to the Director, Division of Compliance, A.E.C.
- (4) Three pages of notes roughly outlining some of my complaints to the AEC.
- (5) Three page letter to the Director of the Department of Transportation.
- (6) Two page letter to the Director of the San Francisco Regional Office of the Environmental Protection Agency.
- (7) Two page letter to the Environmental Defense Fund of N.Y.

After you have considered these materials, and if you find this matter to be in your area of interest, and if you desire to delve deeper into it, please feel free to call on me. I am in the process of formulating a list of questions which, I feel, must be raised in the name of public service and I am willing to help in every way I can.

Con't.../2

2
-2-

I would greatly appreciate any opinions you have concerning this matter and welcome all your advice.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Rowen Jr.
Robert J. Rowen, Jr.

My mailing address is:

Robert J. Rowen, Jr.
2504 "O" Street
Eureka, California 95501

phone (707) 443-3689

cc: Senator Frank Church of Idaho