



50-133

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

825 5TH STREET

EUREKA, CALIFORNIA 95501-1172 PHONE (707) 445-7471

April 10, 1985

Peter Erickson
Project Manager
Humboldt Bay Nuclear Power Plant
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20055

Dear Mr. Erickson:

May I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Agency for allowing us to present the concerns of the citizens of Humboldt County. Every citizen of this county shares concern with the NRC over the need to protect our environment and community.

The NRC has been given a near impossible task of evaluating its own data and the information presented by PG&E, while taking into account the emotional appeals of individuals and special interest groups in the interest of community safety.

It is clear that the need for power is essential for our community's and America's future development. No government, community or family can long survive without energy in the form of light, heat and mechanical power.

In the past, America has relied upon timber, coal and oil for its power needs. The use of these materials is expensive in terms of their effects on the nation's environment. With the advent of nuclear power in the 1950s, a viable and economic alternative was developed.

The reactor at Humboldt Bay began operation in 1963. In 1976, it was taken out of service for routine refueling and seismic studies. In 1979, the accident at Three Mile Island resulted in extensive NRC ordered modifications and staffing requirements for nuclear power plants.

Continued . . .

Peter Erickson
NRC
April 10, 1985
Page 2

Economic conditions and NRC guidelines for the modification of older plants led to PG&E's decision to suspend further research and not restart the plant.

The power company now proposes to SAFSTOR, place the unit in a state of protective storage, until dismantling and disposal can be accomplished.

Opponents to the SAFSTOR concept want the fuel removed and the plant dismantled immediately. There are several valid concerns over the opponent's position:

1. A spent fuel disposal site is not currently available.
2. The risk of radiation exposure to workers will be increased.
3. The volume of radioactive waste will be at its highest level.
4. Onsite storage is the safest storage location at the present time.

Due to the complex emotional and technical aspects of this topic, it is clear an administrative decision by the NRC is appropriate, in lieu of political or "democratic" (vote) options.

Even so, community opinion should be taken into account. Independent scientific studies over the past several months indicate the general population is concerned about nuclear power, but not opposed to nuclear power. The various alliances and other special interest groups are representing other than the general concerns of the electorate. In light of this, I would like to make the following recommendation:

1. The NRC approve PG&E's plan for SAFSTOR, in the best interest of the community and workers alike.
2. That the NRC re-examine current government policy concerning spent fuel reprocessing, and recommend reinstituting reprocessing to the appropriate government bodies for the needed legislation.

Peter Erickson
NRC
April 10, 1985
Page 3

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the time and effort you have devoted to this project.

Sincerely,

Anna Sparks.

ANNA SPARKS
Supervisor, District 5

AS:bjn

HUMBOLDT COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
825 5TH STREET
EUREKA, CALIFORNIA 95501

936

50-133

Peter Erickson
Project Manager
Humboldt Bay Nuclear Power Plant
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20055

