

Joe Fouchard, News Service Branch
Division of Public Information, Headquarters

*Re to
Mason
Pena*
August 21, 1963

Rodney L. Southwick, Assistant to the
Manager for Public Information, SAN

File

CALIFORNIA P.U.C. DENIES BODEGA PETITION

MI:ELS

Enclosed are:

1. Copy of the California Public Utilities Commission decision denying a rehearing to Bodega Bay reactor opponents;
2. S. F. Chronicle story on the action in (1); and
3. Letter to the Editor on Bodega.

Enclosures:

As stated

CC: / Harold Price, REG, HQ, w/encs.
Robert Lowenstein, DLSE, HQ, w/encs.
F. K. Pittman, DED, HQ, w/encs.
Howard Shapar, OGC, HQ, w/encs.
E. W. Smith, Compl. V., SAN, w/encs.

MI

SOUTHWICK:mt
8/21/63

87
8709210491 851217
PDR FOIA
FIREST083-665 PDR



Decision No. 65914 (

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the matter of the application
of PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY for a certificate of
public convenience and necessity
to construct, install, operate
and maintain Unit No. 1, a
nuclear power unit, at its
Bodega Bay Atomic Park.
(Electric)

Application No. 43808

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING

An order granting a certificate for construction of Unit No. 1 at applicant's Bodega Bay Atomic Park was issued on November 8, 1962. (Decision No. 64537, effective November 28, 1962.) Petitioner's unincorporated predecessor sought rehearing on November 28, 1962. Rehearing was denied on January 2, 1963. (Decision No. 64731.) Petitioner's predecessor thereafter filed petitions alleging violation of the certificate decision and for injunction. (January 15 and 31, 1963.) Petitions for injunction were denied on February 13, 1963. (Decision No. 64913.) Thereafter petitioner filed a petition to reopen the proceeding for further hearing. (May 6, 1963.) Reopening was denied on July 9, 1963. (Decision No. 65701.)

On July 31, 1963 petitioner The Northern California Association to Preserve Bodega Head and Harbor, Inc. filed the present petition for rehearing of the order denying reopening. The Commission having considered said petition and each of its

~~DR~~

ho

allegations, and being of the opinion that no good cause has been shown for the granting thereof, IT IS ORDERED that said petition is hereby denied.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 20th day of August, 1963.

President

/s/ EVERETT C. McKEAGE

/s/ GEORGE G. GROVER

/s/ FREDERICK B. HOLOBOFF

Commissioners

I will file a concurring opinion later.

/s/ PETER E. MITCHELL

I would grant the relief requested.

/s/ WILLIAM M. BENNETT

PUC Adamant

Bodega Appeal Rejected Again

The California Public Utilities Commission refused again yesterday to reconsider the Bodega Bay power plant matter, and Commission Chairman William Bennett again dissented from the majority vote.

It was the third denial of petitions filed by the Northern California Association to reserve Bodega Head and Harbor, Inc., and the second time Bennett has cast the lone dissenting vote.

In its 4-to-1 ruling yesterday, the Commission said simply that the latest petition failed to show cause why it should reconsider the permit it has already granted Pacific Gas and Electric Company to build the atomic plant.

The Commission previously rejected the association's petitions for reviewing on January 2 and July 9, and on February 13 it turned down a petition for an injunction.

David Pesonen, executive secretary for the conservationist group, said the Commission's latest denial was not a defeat.

"It is simply the last administrative procedure we must follow before we take the matter to the Supreme Court," he said.

Nearly 200 persons, meanwhile, attended an informational hearing on the nuclear power plant before the Marin Board of Supervisors.

Bodega Head is in adjoining Sonoma county but a majority of the Marin supervisors approved the hearing

because of the proximity of the proposed site to Marin county.

All but two of the 18 speakers opposed the PG&E project as a threat to the safety of inhabitants and a blow to the natural beauty of the area.

F. F. Mautz, chief civil engineer for PG&E, and Attorney Paul Golis, spokesman for the Sonoma County Association for the Development of Bodega Bay, favored the plan.

Golis said the atomic power plant would be worth \$1 million a year in taxes to Sonoma county.

DR-117

Fresno Chronicle 8/21/63
Ping Pong at the Head

Editor! — Unfortunately the proposed Bodega reactor has become a political ping pong ball as partisan groups join their respective bandwagons, confusing, distorting, and ignoring the basic issues which remain:

1. What will be the biological effect of temperature fluctuation and chemical issuance?
2. How great is the danger of an atomic reactor located near a known earthquake fault?
3. Was the permit legal, as there was no public hearing?
4. Is the plant potentially an economic asset or a waste economy?
5. Where does one place aesthetic values . . . ?

These issues cannot be lost in political sparring, but must be decided and shared by all citizens and all industry everywhere.

Redding.

KENN ROE.

SECRET NO. 50-205

1733 Walnut Street
El Cerrito, California 94530
September 4, 1963

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman
Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C.



Dear Dr. Seaborg:

I urge you to turn down the request of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company for construction of a reactor at its proposed Bodega Head site. The reasons, which have been given by the opponents of the construction, that I support are:

- 1) The site is a valuable scenic and marine biological resource, the quality of which would be impaired seriously by the proposed construction.
- 2) Proximity to the San Andreas Fault leaves open the possibility of a catastrophic occurrence, which might result in excessive amounts of radioactive material polluting the environment.

Yours Sincerely,

Paul Concus

8709180241 3pp 6177

DATA CONTROL
1735 1/21/63 L.
11000, Calif 94530

DATE OF DOCUMENT:

7-10-63

DATE RECEIVED

7-10-63

NO.:

5177

LTR.

MEMO:

REPORT:

OTHER:

X

ORIG:

CC:

OTHER:

X

5 rechecked

ACTION NECESSARY

☒

CONCURRENCE

☐

DATE ANSWERED:

NO ACTION NECESSARY

☐

COMMENT

☐

BY:

FILE CODE:

50-205

CLASSIF:

U

POST OFFICE

REG. NO:

DESCRIPTION: (Must Be Unclassified)

Mr. [unclear] that we have been the recipient
of [unclear] for [unclear] at [unclear] site.

ENCLOSURES:

REFERRED TO

DATE

RECEIVED BY

DATE

Re: [unclear]

9-10

W/extra

10

by [unclear]

U. [unclear]

9-10

W/extra, for info

U. [unclear]

9-10

W/extra, for info

REMARKS:

Re Distribution: 1 - formal file
1 - AEC file
1 - [unclear] file

5177

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

9-6
(Date)

TO:

DR

___ For Information

Dr For appropriate handling

___ For preparation of reply for Chairman's
signature (Refer to Manual Chapter 0240)

___ For discussion at Commissioners' Information
Meeting

___ For distribution to other Commissioners

___ Daily Log

REMARKS:



CL
Howard C. Brown, Jr.
For the Chairman

6177