

TERA



Aug. 5, 1979

Dear Sir,

CKET NUMBER

E-CD. & UTIL. EAC. 50-522,523

I am writing in opposition to the building of a proposed Shagit nuclear plant, with respect for all the other brave protesters and yourselves, with the following:

I wish to remind you that I have written to you several times thru the last few years (to the AEC, the President's Committee, etc) with little response and no results as yet. I conferred to you that I had witnessed the transport of nuclear facility parts in unsafe conditions in 1968 from Berkeley Calif. to its 3-mile-high site; the parts were perishable, were incorrectly boxed, were subjected to hazardous test conditions to

POOR
ORIGINAL

1053 265

7909290 405

G

determine safety, were inadequately tested by "agitated" technicians. Alas, it was my continued information thru 1977 AND THIS YEAR that the coolant system was in fact UNSAFE AND would most probably fail or explode, at 3-mile-high. The same is then AND NOW there in the plans of Skagit plants. There is the same inadequate "molding" devices - FOR - building-parts available, likewise, the same unprofessional technicians needed to update, rebuild AND replace present plans AND structures. In addition to the fact that the similarities are greatest between Skagit plans AND the 3-mile-high plants than other plants, there is a very real

POOR
ORIGINAL

1053 266

earthquake damage factor which make it not-excessable-to-build because of poor structural possibilities in working technically with what you have now.

I worked temporarily again at U.C. Berkeley in 1976-7, at the Physics Lab - Lawrence Rad Lab. on the hill. Previously, in 1968, I worked with Dr. Krapf of the Physics Dept. on campus. I found it an agitated place to work in 1977 as in 1968, fully exposed politically and secularly. I exchanged letters in view of discussions of nuclear power plant safety with physicists at Stanford Univ. and govt agencies at Berkeley, then. It was difficult to locate a verbal agreement as to the probability of danger, and we

POOR
ORIGINAL

1053 267

were reminded, as I remind you, that in 1968, arguments of nuclear power plant safety culminated in court and in govt investigations with a notable question of a high degree of sabotage-thru-neglect possible, i.e. this third question of sabotage, accident, and neglect must be noted for the plants. Altho found absent in the 3-mile-high incident, it is still a fact that mismanagement, and poor conditions and poor building techniques resulted, as it was most probable to result, in failure.

I read (in the news) that there is the same agitation present in Skagit County as for 3-mile-high, in procuring contracts, plans, sites, and personnel. I find opposition to be mostly orderly and informed but not fully presentable, as at 3-mile,

POOR
ORIGINAL

I hazard a guess that the same conditions exist for building this plant for the populace as was in the past at Berkeley; oppressive, with the benefit of the doubt being lost in a rush for adequate funding and organization only.

I find personally also another view: that the populace here exists in enough of a state of flux to modernize that plans for the Skagit plant are being logically overridden by everyone. There are dangers of overcrowding, inadequate but vast schooling, gang violence, and general apathy and terrorism; these are newly emerged problems I found there last year. The possibility of funneling these problems through new jobs and new facilities such as Skagit Valley's is not feasible I find;

POOR
ORIGINAL

1053 269

the problems (as in 1968) are too covert as yet. I believe that there is more "danger" to the idea of a nuclear power plant so close to population than is overt thru your sided investigations.

In conclusion it seems most important to remind you that, to my knowledge, the plans and structural holds of Skagit Valley and 3-mile-high plants are too alike not to predetermine that accidents and/or mishaps will happen. In particular, insulative materials and devices for both were worked together and will probably fail together, as well as walling materials and fire-resistant materials. It seems as if the plans for all this seem to have been dunked for several hours in a hot bath - leaving it indiscernable to the local interested

POOR
ORIGINAL

1053 270

parties. I think you would risk a
visible hysteria or right reaction
to build it or plan to build it in the
next few years locally. It would
appear that there could be time
to replan or resituate the plants
without agitated work and with
better resources as close as
5-10 years from now to guess.
I would hope you could resituate
the plants away from populated
area and replan, in the near future.
[And, you know, I might add, that
in the past few years I was not
allowed to register to vote in the
U.S. in my local area. I had to
secure registration rights from
the city manager's office. I do not
vote readily now, fearing loss of my
voting records and rights for all
future times. I add this of myself
so that you might know that as

POOR
ORIGINAL

1053 271

AN active individual involved in
all this modernization of basic
wants and necessities, there are
losses I have which involve you,
perhaps not now but in the future,
as is the vote. It is an example
that the loss resulting from your
present plans will be greatly evident
and multiplied later for individuals
themselves, and that seems enough
reason for me to pause and continue
better later. I hope you would do
the same. Without regard to any extremism,
I would remain so, Yours truly,

Dolores Giff
(né) Dolores Giff
U.C.B. (1904 > Psychology
Sociology)

POOR
ORIGINAL

1053 272