

DOCKET NUMBER 50-423
PROC. & UTIL. SEC.



148 High St.
Mystic, Ct. 06355
July 21, 1983

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H St. NW
Washington, D. C. 20555

SERVED JUL 26 1983

Dear NRC:

Enclosed is a letter to the Connecticut legislature's Energy and Public Utilities Committee concerning Northeast Utilities and the nuclear industry.

P I did not attend the recent local hearing on environmental concerns re the licensing of Millstone III. Once permission is granted to build the plant, licensing is foreordained. I understood it to be a hearing on the impact of the plant on flora, fauna, the Sound, and the possibility of radiation contamination, on which even the experts disagree. Do not be misled by the light turnout. This was a specialized hearing for specialized concerns, perhaps to give the public the illusion of being heard. Why isn't the final (and all other hearings) hearing held locally, open to all? As I understand, it is to be in Washington and open only to special applicants. Very convenient for NU, but not the citizenry.

There is considerable unease and disaffection with the nuclear industry and NU, and not only by the Conn. Citizens' Action Group. The citizenry is beset by a state government indebted to special interests, powerful ones such as NU. Government on all levels doesn't protect the populace. Quite the reverse. Rather, we need protection from their depredations.

The enclosed letter is a small part of considerable correspondence and information sent to the EPU, much of it on your role as monitor. I'm sure it is available to you should you find this of interest. I understand a congressional committee is now investigating the NRC for possible collusion, dereliction of duty, etc., which Thomas Devine had documented a few months ago before the City Club Forum in Cleveland.

The cost of Millstone III is prohibitive, the money better spent diversifying. There will be the future problem of the final disposition of the waste, now stored on site, on which no one can agree. All out of our pocket. To have a third plant on one densely populated site is irresponsible, given the uncertain monitoring of a dangerous technology with increasingly unanswered questions. Yet, we have no redress. You have been secretive and possibly delinquent; you have not served the public first, and have been part of the problem, not the solution.

Given the serious manifold problems nuclear power presents, and more surely to come, no further plants should be licensed until the populace has firm guarantees for safety, efficiency, accountability, and that the cost of electricity doesn't become so prohibitive it is available only to the few. The citizenry is outraged.

Sincerely, M. P. Smith

I was particularly taken with Philadelphia Electric's campaign on behalf of the nuclear industry to infiltrate the faculty and schools, providing texts and slides in which all alternatives except nuclear were discounted; i.e. teachers' manuals advised them to say "windmills are unsightly"; children told to "go home and tell your parents what you've learned"; and a theological paper on nuclear energy was issued ("God let us discover it just in time"). (over, please)

D503

① One member of NRC of a firm that manufactures nuclear plant components?

8307270110 830721
PDR ADDCK 05000423
PDR

It smacks of fascism. Not only does the industry want to control our pursestrings and life-style, but also hearts and minds. All paid for by ratepayers, who, as I understand it, have brought suit, now pending.

Please forgive typing.

Please introduce these letters at licensing hearing. m. l.

50-423



148 High St.
Mystic, Ct. 06355
July 21, 1983

Energy and Public Utilities Committee
Connecticut General Assembly
State Capitol
Hartford, Ct. 06106

RECEIVED JUL 26 1983

Dear Committee:

Here are some addenda to my recent packet and letters on the nuclear industry; the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Northeast Utilities, and the Millstone complex. It is irresponsible to allow them to continue to milk and bilk the public with yet another huge rate increase. Stop Millstone's abusive monopoly of NU and single main source of power. Also demand Freedom of Information for the public in every aspect of their operation. They are exceedingly closemouthed.

Clippings on various pertinent subjects enclosed.

After the recent firings for unspecified reasons, which NU refused to divulge, NU absolved itself of any responsibility for them, saying the guards were the responsibility of the firm from which they were contracted, and were not NU employees. After the recent surveyors' strike (they struck for the petty reason of quibbling over assignments) NU declared itself not responsible but Stone and Webster. 3,500 other employees honored the picket line also. Yet, under the agreement the legislature negotiated we must pay for strike work stoppages or other expenses not under NU's control. They assume, conveniently, no responsibility, but we must. (Clipping on subject in recent packet.

July 2, 1983
After the guard firings, a 'vandalism' incident at Millstone III occurred: cut cables from the control room to the intake building drawing cooling water for the reactor. After the firing of inept guards, they still can't secure the site. Where were the guards? Don't they learn from experience? Who pays, again? Personnel are obviously not trained or supervised properly (again - history of industry on all levels). Is security even possible, esp. air and sea? Against dedicated saboteurs? Or even neighborhood kids? Clipping, The Day, AP, July 20, '83: "officials acknowledge 'latest incident of insider sabotage'" (a national problem I mentioned in recent letter), this incident at LaSalle plant of wiring to a key piece of safety equipment switched, the reversed wiring in a switch controlling part of the emergency backup system cooling the reactor. Officials of NRC and utility "were reluctant to use word 'sabotage'" - again the point made of collusion, brushing off or covering up problems in my recent correspondence. And what of hidden sabotage or defects by disgruntled or careless welders, etc., not discovered for years perhaps, not to mention faulty design, construction and other recurring problems. (Recent news piece: welders at TMI bought into the union, someone else took their tests). What is the caliber of personnel at all levels? Guards, management with me-generation ethics, and executives with old robber baron public-be-damned instincts.

As to the corroded reactor shield problems, their removal and storage problem, why are they not needed now, but were needed before? The industry has been playing it by ear and learning on the job since its beginning, and in a dangerous and expensive enterprise. Why so many plants with the same problem? And the same manufacturer. But the NRC has once again changed the rules to accommodate the industry, said shield no longer necessary, (another point in my previous letters, which also documents their cutting corners.)

Millstone is similar in design to the eight plants with cracked cooling pipes that could lead to meltdown. Millstone, recently inspected, but officials say pipes could go at any time. Yet, NRC, against the advice of its chief

safety officer, bowed to plant owners and GE, the manufacturer, (see clipping) and allowed a delay until industry sponsored laboratory tests on cracking problem is completed. (Industry polices itself -see previous letters) Commissioner Gilinsky is quoted, "We're all working in the face of a lot of uncertainty." The Day, AP, July 6, '83 (see clipping), the NRC, after Davis Bessey+ TMI, wants automatic shutdown systems upgraded since the third such incident, Salem, N. J. (and a possible fourth-Florida plant). Salem had "inadequate maintenance of circuit breakers" and had "improperly classified circuit breakers as non safety equipment." Why wasn't this done when the first plant was built? This would not have come to light at all if the NRC and utilities had their way. (See my recent letter on whistleblowers.) We have no reasonable guarantees that the monitoring or management of Millstone is not equally inept or venal, and many reasons to believe they are. It could well be a time bomb, which could contaminate the whole densely populated Long Island Sound area and the surrounding countryside.

The NRC is now investigating management integrity, ^{competence} safety violation, falsified records at TMI. Too little, too late. And only under compulsion, ~~that it has become public knowledge~~. But, as you can deduce from the

~~that it has become public knowledge~~ reassurances will follow to protect the industry. We never hear a word, a quote, from the NRC inspector at Millstone. Why isn't he accessible to the public. Why doesn't he keep the public informed down to the smallest detail?

As I have written previously, there have been problems with the industry since its inception: the NRC's role as an arm of the industry, and its reluctance to inform or take action; on plant design; manufacturers' equipment; quality control; construction defects and problems; repeated failures of equipment and personnel; changing and relaxing the regulations after the fact; poor training or supervision of personnel; mussels in the water intake system that could have serious consequences; and even, at Millstone, the hiring procedures and quality of personnel at least a few of whom are functional illiterates and have been given a year to learn to read, two sources have informed me. (The illiterates are, I assume, in lesser positions but are required to learn to read rather sophisticated official jargon and in a year! One wonders why they were hired in the first place.)

We only know of the problems the industry admits to. What are they not admitting? They have never been informative.

We must pay for every mistake or miscalculation by NU, which takes no responsibility for its actions and takes no risk, NU and its shareholders get a free ride at our expense. I didn't quite understand the doublespeak in the news piece on the DPUC-directed audit of NU: "the audit is paid for by the utility and is included in the rate base for customer billing" - ~~at~~ we pay for everything directly or indirectly.

I would like to know how much replacement fuel we have paid for since Millstone first went on line. Why must we pay? The responsibility is so diffuse no one is accountable directly to us; yet we are accountable and must pay.

What can the legislature do to see to our safety and solvency?

Sincerely,

M. P. Smith

cc to DPUC, NRC, Consumer Counsel Zitser, CPTV