



50-498,499

Kim Eastman
105 Churchwood
San Antonio, Tx. 78148

June 26, 1981

Dear Mr. Bechhoefer,

I am writing this letter to you solely on my own behalf, NOT as a representative of Citizens Concerned About Nuclear Power.

I have been a member of CCANP since December 1979, and became involved with the intervention at about the time of the Show-Cause order. I attended both the November and March prehearing conferences, as well as a few days of the hearing. Over this time, I have learned many things (I am only 19 years old), but have also been disappointed on many occasions.

There have been many times when it appeared that CCANP might not even participate in these proceedings, and I believed we had finally overcome all obstacles. Like the other parties to this hearing, CCANP had truly hoped that it would be over with before September. Personally speaking, I would like to see Lanny Sinkin go to class once and awhile. But it looks like he will begin next semester the same way he ended the last one. Since the Board has scheduled the hearings to continue in Houston, CCANP and Lanny Sinkin are faced with three choices: 1) Lanny can cut class 2) CCANP can attempt to find an attorney, or 3) CCANP can just not participate.


I am shocked at your decision to continue in Houston for two reasons. First, I think that each partner to the STNP should have a portion of the hearings in its city, either divided equally among them, or based upon their share of the STNP (Austin has 14%; San Antonio has 28%). Secondly, I cannot believe that you told the representative of the League of Women Voters that you objected to holding hearings in Austin because of a September

DSO
6/10

bond issue or referendum. She said that your decision was based upon the fact that the Board tried to stay out of politics. Making the decision NOT to hold the hearings in Austin, based upon upcoming political events, is in itself a political decision. It is an attempt to squish publicity about the STNP, which simply will not work. (By the way, Austin will have a referendum in November, not September, so if the Board wishes to stay unpolitical, September hearings in Austin would be better than October hearings. San Antonio will have a bond issue in August or September, but it is of no political concern, as citizens do not have the right to vote on this issue, and the San Antonio city council would approve it even if the STNP sank through the ground.)

Austin owns a share of this project, and should be included as a hearing site. I hope that you will give serious consideration to reconsidering your previous decision.

Respectfully submitted for the record


Kim Eastman