

Distribution:  
Formal  
Supplementary  
AEC Public Document Room  
SAN Public Document Room

Supplemental File

REC:CTE

Packet No. 50-205

bcc: E. G. Case, RL  
J. Sullivan, REG  
G. Hadlock, OGC  
C. T. Edwards, REG

JUN 8 1964

Mr. Emil J. Hatcher  
Assistant Professor  
of Geophysics  
Washington University  
Department of Earth Sciences  
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

Dear Professor Hatcher:

This replies to your letter of April 29, 1964, addressed to Mr. Rutledge Hanson, U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce. Mr. Hanson referred your letter to this office as a matter which the Atomic Energy Commission currently has under consideration. At the request of the Atomic Energy Commission, and in connection with its review of the application submitted by Pacific Gas and Electric Company for a license to construct a reactor at Redoga Head, the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey has been asked by the AEC to prepare a report relative to the seismicity of the proposed site. The report has not yet been submitted. We will inform you at such time as it is available for distribution.

Concerning the relationship of the San Andreas fault to the Stanford linear electron accelerator, I am enclosing a copy of a 1961 Report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which you will find informative on that subject.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by  
E. G. Case

8709180351 851217  
PDR FOIA  
FIREST085-665 PDR

Edmon G. Case, Acting Director  
Division of Reactor Licensing

Enclosure:

\*Background Information On  
The High Energy Physics  
Program and The Proposed  
Stanford Linear Electron  
Accelerator Project\*

OFFICE	REG	RL		
SURNAME	CTEdwards:pg	GHadlock	EGCase	
DATE	6/3/64	6/4/64	6/4/64	

8709180351

**Nuclear Power** *SF Chronicle 5/15/64*

Editor—It would terribly weaken the arguments of the Bodega plant proponents to admit that our opposition has primarily been on points of conservation. The safety issue has only come to the fore more recently, and is based on the Bodega Head location only. The proponents rather make the convenient but inaccurate blanket indictment that we oppose all atomic power per se.

In the meanwhile, to paraphrase Mr. Feeney (Letters, April 30), PG&E has failed miserably to explain one extremely important inconsistency: If atomic plants are the future source of supply for the steadily increasing demands of power, and if the Bodega site is the only feasible spot for it in this area (as claimed by PG&E), where are they going to put any more of these future atomic plants that we will need? . . .

MARGRITA F. KLASSEN.

Sonoma.

*SF Chronicle 5/15/64*  
**One Chance**

Editor—PG&E's plans to build a nuclear power plant at Bodega Head seem fraught with awkward irresponsibility. Hasn't it occurred to these men that they only have to be wrong ONCE in their calculations? . . . One hundred per cent safety should be the goal of a public utility. One wonders how this can possibly be guaranteed considering the location PG&E has chosen.

PAUL BOLER.

San Francisco.

RECEIVED  
MAY 18 11 11 35  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMM.  
DIVISION OF  
LICENSING & REGULATION

50-205 *fx*

MEMO ROUTE SLIP Form AEC-68 (Rev. May 14, 1947)		See me about this. Note and return.	For concurrence. For signature.	For action. For information.
TO (Name and unit) <b>Joe Vouchard, WFL, HQ</b>	INITIALS	<b>Attached are two Kodak clips from Letters to the Editor, S.Y. Chronicle, 5/15/64.</b>		
<b>Harold Price, WFL, HQ</b>	DATE			
TO (Name and unit) <b>Robert Lammstein, WFL, HQ</b>	INITIALS			
<b>F. E. Pittman, WRD, HQ</b>	DATE			
TO (Name and unit) <b>J. B. Lyman, WFL, HQ</b>	INITIALS			
<b>R. W. Smith, Compl. V., SAN</b>	DATE			
FROM (Name and unit) <b>Dale J. Cook Asst. Info. Officer SAN</b>	REMARKS			
PHONE NO.	DATE <b>5/15/64</b>			

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1957-O-422007

## Article Hits A-Plant; PG&E says 'Sabotage'

*Santa Rosa Independent 5/12/64*

By DON ENGDAHL

The possibilities of a disastrous earthquake-caused radiation accident at the proposed Bodega Bay nuclear power plant are explored in a publication by the St. Louis Citizens Committee for Nuclear Information.

The searing criticism of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. power plant proposal was released today — and produced as searing a reaction from a utilities company spokesman, who called it "astounding for its deceitfulness... sabotage."

The magazine, Nuclear Information, deals with the possibility that an earthquake along the San Andreas fault zone near the site might cause release of radiation.

It warns that "innumerable variables intervene to decrease or magnify any reactor accident," and says not enough data is available to accurately predict results.

But it adds the splitting of

the reactor vessel to PG&E's calculation of a "maximum credible accident" in the plant, compares it to a 1957 Atomic Energy Commission study of major accidents, and concludes:

—In the "unlikely but possible situation" of a westerly or southwesterly wind at Bodega Head, "nearly everyone" in Bodega Bay "would die within the first day."

—In Santa Rosa, "many of

(Continued on Page 10, Col. 3)

# Article Raps A-plant Site; PG&E Replies: 'Sabotage'

(Continued from Page 1)

the people exposed would be very sick," and in San Francisco, with the "more likely" condition of a northwest wind and a temperature inversion condition that would trap releases, the article speculates that some would be ill, there would be long-term radiation effects, and finds the "suggestion" that crops would have to be destroyed and agriculture restricted "for distances of hundreds of miles."

The St. Louis group is described as a committee of scientists and laymen; the Bodega article was written by Lindsay Mattison, a layman, and Richard Daly, holder of a master's degree in electrical engineering and with a background as an assistant mathematician at the Argonne Laboratory. Both are magazine staff members.

The article was reviewed and approved by the publication's scientific advisory board, made up of 25 scientists.

## PG&E Reacts

Hal Stroube, PG&E press representative, called the article a "completely one-sided review of the Bodega situation..."

The writers "never approached PG&E and asked for facts or explanation... the article is astounding for its deceitfulness. It is biased and inflammatory... a clever and dangerous sabotage not only of the Bodega project but by extension, of the nation's civilian atomic power program, all done with a pseudo-scientific air of authority."

The heart of the Nuclear Information argument is that an earthquake might result in a breach of the reactor's protec-

tive vessel, releasing products of nuclear fission to the atmosphere.

It is critical of PG&E for not evaluating the results of such an accident in its application to the AEC for permission to build the plant.

It reviews statements by some geologists—including a team from the U.S. Geological Survey—that a 1906-magnitude earthquake might produce shifts of rock of Bodega Head itself, and says it is "unreasonable" not to consider an earthquake as a "credible cause of the maximum credible accident" to the plant.

It is "also unreasonable," the article says, to "rely on the fact that all the radioactivity will be contained in the intact drywell."

(The drywell, as defined by PG&E, is the steel shell surrounding the reactor, plus associated pumps and piping.)

Mr. Stroube said today that the reactor "will be designed so carefully that even under the most severe earthquake action that scientists expect it would not breach and release fission products."

What the authors of the article are doing, he said, is "postulating an accident which will not happen."

The article, however, says "the hazards of such an accident must be evaluated, not avoided."

## New Design

It deals also with a recent PG&E amendment to its application that offers a "design concept" for bedding the reactor on sand and surrounding it with a compressible material to ac-

commodate limited shifting of the underlying bedrock.

Although the company emphasized it does not expect any movement if any occurs it "would not amount to more than a fraction of an inch," the amendment says an "incredible" one-foot movement would mean no damage or impairment of function and even with a two-foot movement the reactor suppression system would remain intact.

The Nuclear Information article says "an expert in earthquake resistant structures said the techniques for (protecting the reactor) had been developed under AEC auspices and the important information about its remains classified."

Mr. Stroube says it is PG&E's concept, that it is "not radical or unusual," and called the article's statement "ridiculous."

The article says, after discussion of the possibility of radioactive releases from the plant, that with "such an accident possible, and in fact made more likely by the siting of the Bodega Reactor... PG&E's case before the AEC will not be uncontested..."

The issues, it says "must be given the most deep and searching attention by experts of complete integrity. The public must be fully acquainted with exactly the risks involved for them in such a project."

In an editorial note on The Peaceful Atom, the magazine poses the problem of "How can we balance the value of a nuclear operation against the risk of possible harm, and thus decide whether the project is worth

doing."

It says an "independent evaluation of the benefits of a nuclear power plant, over and above those of a conventional power plant is also needed."

59-205 File

MEMO ROUTE SLIP Form AEC-98 (Rev. May 14, 1947)		See me about this. Note and return.	For concurs. For signature.	For action. For information.
TO (Name and unit) <b>Joe Fouchard, BFI, HQ</b> <b>Harold Price, REC, HQ</b>	INITIALS  DATE	<b>Attached is a Redoga clip from the Santa Rosa Press Democrat of 5/12/64.</b>		
TO (Name and unit) <b>Robert Lowenstein, REC, HQ</b> <b>F. E. Pittman, REC, HQ</b>	INITIALS  DATE			
TO (Name and unit) <b>E. D. Lyman, BFI, HQ</b> <b>R. W. Smith, Compl V., SAN</b>	INITIALS  DATE <b>SAN</b>			
FROM (Name and unit) <b>Dale J. Cook</b> <b>Asst. Info. Officer</b> <b>SAN</b>	REMARKS			
PHONE NO.	DATE <b>5/14/64</b>			

RECEIVED  
MAY 19 11 9 39  
U.S. AIR FORCE  
DIVISION OF  
LICENSING & REGULATION

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1957-O-422007