

RECEIVED
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

1. 53

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY
COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

1867 East Ave. Q Twelve
Palmdale, Calif.
Sept. 25, 1961

Dear Sirs;

We own property at Bodega Bay, California and wish to register a strong protest at the proposed P.G. and E. nuclear power plant to be erected on Bodega Head. We presume that the AEC granted permission for this.

Aside from the fact that this area, in our opinion and in that of many conservationists, should certainly be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations as a park, there are several other considerations.

The one that comes most prominently to mind is that this is a fault area which if you recall has been subject to some rather severe earthquakes. Indeed there is a story going the rounds that the engineers for P.G. and E. after much effort managed to locate the original site accurately astride the fault. When this was pointed out to them they moved the site a couple of thousand feet. Perhaps this is an apocryphal incident, but it seems to characterize the lack of sound overall planning connected with this proposed plant. We would certainly appreciate an explanation of why it should be considered necessary to locate a nuclear reactor in a fault area to the windward of an extensive dairy and orchard region, and a pretty fair commercial and sports fishing area.

While you are at it, as a taxpayer I would also like to know why the AEC waited until after considerable nuclear wastes had been disposed of in the ocean to check the disposal containers under actual use, and why the AEC allowed a contractor to violate AEC regulations by dumping containers of nuclear wastes in Massachusetts Bay in shallow water?

Urban D. Busiek
Urban D. Busiek
1867 E. Ave. Q 12
Palmdale, Calif.

8709180165 B51217
PDR FOIA
FIRESTDB5-665 PDR