

PLEASE REPLY TO: Senator Richard (Dick) Stone  
Suite 200B-2639 North Monroe  
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

United States Senate

June 9, 1977

Respectfully referred to:

Chairman  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Because of the desire of this office to be responsive to all inquiries and communications, your consideration of the attached is requested. Your findings and views, in duplicate form, along with return of the enclosure, will be appreciated by

*Richard (Dick) Stone*

Richard (Dick) Stone  
United States Senator

RDS:mlt

TLH-7

H 2

GD

870

C. U. R. E .  
(CITIZENS UNITED FOR RESPONSIBLE ENERGY)

Else H. van Hoek  
Director  
9885 So. Indian River Dr  
Fort Pierce, Fla 33450

June 3, 1977

Senator Richard Stone  
Washington, D.C.

File 1177711509

Dear Senator Stone:

Thank you for your show of interest in your letter dd. April 26 to Mr. E.S. Prime, who is also a CURE Director.

We received a short reply from the NRC, stating that the mission of the NRC is to assure that if nuclear energy is used in private industry, the public is protected... This didn't do much to alleviate the anxiety of our roughly 200 members.

Since then, a malfunctioning valve in the coolant system of the plant necessitated another shutdown. Although FPL had said the 4000 gal of primary coolant spill (April 5) would be processed in the plant or allowed to sit for 3 to 6 weeks to permit radioactive decay, it was discharged on the 9th day when the water valve caused overheating and the next plant shutdown. A glance at the enclosed performance record of St. Lucie I will show some of the reasons for our communication.

Our concern is heightened by the fact that the NRC Board has recently decided that the cash investment makes it advisable to proceed with another plant, even though no other actual sites were considered beforehand. Furthermore, evacuation planning in Florida in case of nuclear accident or war is almost nonexistent and Civil Defense in Florida is acutely concerned.

We urge you to use your influence to achieve better evacuation plans for our State and to delay the creation of new nuclear plants until all its extraordinary problems of performance, waste storage, insurance and evacuation plans have been resolved.

Just received the news that St. Lucie I is DOWN again.... this time for a malfunction in the Generator. It would seem to me that SOMEBODY ought to make sure FPL claims that in the first 4 months of operation St. Lucie I saved more than 26 million in fuel costs.... I can't help but wonder how much was spent on repairs and ordered modifications....

Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

*Else H. van Hoek*

# ST. LUCIE I REACTOR PERFORMANCE RECORD

'75 Testing  
August 12, 1975 .. Overpressurization

		DAYS ON	DAYS OF
'76			
June 28	..... Plant "on line"		
July 10	..... Plant shuts down Uneven Core heating	13	
Aug 17	..... Overpressurization		
September			
October			
November			
December 23	..... Plant "on line"		153
'77			
January			
February			
March			
April 3	..... Plant shuts Hydrogen fire in line		
6	..... Primary coolant water spill 4000 gal.		
12	..... Plant opens		9
13	..... 50 drums of radioactive gravel sent to Barnwell		
15	..... Plant shuts Faulty water valve in motor cooling system (1) Radioactive water discharged to ocean (2) after 9 days.		15?
30	..... Plant on line		
May			
June 1	..... Breakdown of generator	31	

## NOTES ON FPL MEMORY....

- (1) FPL, in Miami Herald Apr 18 says "The plant also was shut down all of last November and part of December for modification"/
- (2) Stuart News, April 13: "FPL is considering reprocessing the water through the plant or permitting it to sit for the next 6 weeks to decompose completely".....