

State of California



Fair Political Practices Commission

P.O. BOX 807 • SACRAMENTO, 95804 ••• 1100 K STREET BUILDING, SACRAMENTO, 95814

June 18, 1976

A 76-272

Claire Paget
5651 Taft Avenue
La Jolla, California 92037

Dear Ms. Paget:

Thank you for your letter of June 8, 1976, inquiring whether Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., New England Electric System and Northern States Power Company filed according to the requirements of the Political Reform Act.

There are two requirements for filing statements and copies of materials which each of the three companies might have under the Political Reform Act. The first requirement is that companies which spend \$500 or more urging the defeat of a ballot measure must file campaign statements with the Secretary of State disclosing all expenditures. Some of the expenditures which a company may make are not included in the amount of money which must be disclosed. For instance, the cost of a regularly published newsletter or periodical which is circulated to an organization's members, employees, shareholders and others is specifically excluded.

The second requirement relates to mass mailings. Government Code Section 84305 requires that "a copy of every mass mailing in support of or in opposition to a state candidate or state measure shall be sent to the Commission on the same day on which it is mailed to the public generally." Government Code Section 82041.5 defines "mass mailings" as two hundred or more identical pieces of mail.

The Fair Political Practices Commission has insufficient information at the present time to determine whether the three companies have fully complied with the requirements of the Political Reform Act. However, the following information should be of assistance to you.

June 18, 1976

We have determined that Northern States Power Company has reported expenditures incurred in opposing Proposition 15 on campaign statements filed with the Secretary of State. The Commission has received copies of the May 14, 1976, mailing sent by Northern States Power Company. New England Electric System has also filed campaign statements with the Secretary of State. The Fair Political Practices Commission has not received a copy of New England Electric System's May 17, 1976, letter. Pennsylvania Power & Light Company has not filed a campaign statement with the Secretary of State's Office. The Commission has received a copy of their April 27, 1976, mailing.

As stated above, the staff of the Fair Political Practices Commission does not have sufficient information at the present time to state whether Pennsylvania Power & Light Company expended \$500 or more in opposing Proposition 15 to be required to file campaign statements. We have insufficient information about New England Electric System's May 17, letter to determine whether it was a "mass mailing" within Government Code Section 82041.5. Any information you might have about additional Pennsylvania Power & Light Company expenditures and the number of California New England Electric Systems shareholders would therefore be helpful.

The staff of the Fair Political Practices Commission will be reviewing the campaign statements and mass mailings filed in connection with the 15 propositions on the June 8, 1976, primary ballot. Companies which may have failed to file the necessary campaign statements and copies of mass mailings will be advised and appropriate action may be taken.

Thank you for your interest in the Political Reform Act. I am enclosing, for your information, a copy of the Political Reform Act, as amended. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Barbara Campbell

Barbara Campbell
Counsel, Enforcement
Division

BC:nc

Enclosure

bcc: Jeanne Pritchard



TWO NORTH NINTH STREET, ALLENTOWN, PA. 18101 PHONE: (215) 821-5151

JACK K. BUSBY
President
821-5218

Dear California Shareowner:

A brief note concerning the California Initiative on nuclear power, scheduled for voting on June 8.

We see the vote on this Initiative as critical, not only for California but for the country as a whole. We do not believe the nation's energy needs can be met for the balance of this century without effective use of both coal and nuclear fuels.

Since this is our conviction, we are enclosing, for your consideration, what we believe to be a thorough and thoughtful review of the nuclear power issue -- a reprint of Hans Bethe's recent article in the Scientific American. I urge you to read it. Dr. Bethe is a world-renowned physicist, a Nobel laureate in that field. His credentials are both notable and impeccable.

Sincerely,


Jack K. Busby

Encl.



NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

414 NICOLLET MALL
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55401

May 14, 1976

D. F. McELROY
Chairman of the Board

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION 15

Dear NSP Shareholder:

On June 8, Californians will vote on Proposition 15 -- the nuclear initiative. As you know, Northern States Power Company does not generate electricity in the State of California. However, we feel that we must express our opinion to you because the use of nuclear power to generate electricity is an issue which concerns the entire country, and especially those utility companies, such as NSP, which presently produce electricity with nuclear power.

The nuclear initiative in California represents a very serious threat to the future of nuclear power development in the United States. If it passes, similar legislative measures are expected in many other states. The measure is not being promoted as antinuclear, but if it passes on June 8, it is expected to result not only in a moratorium on future nuclear plants, but also in the eventual shutdown of existing nuclear plants in California. Other states are already following the example set there. Efforts are underway in some 20 other states to bring the nuclear controversy to a vote. Proposition 15, if it passes, is predicted to have a crippling effect on the nuclear industry and on the energy picture of the entire country.

Nuclear power is a vital part of the NSP system. Our experience has illustrated that it is a reliable, safe and economical way to produce electricity.

In 1975, one out of every two kilowatt-hours produced by NSP came from its nuclear plants. In December, 1975, 58 percent of the electricity we produced came from our three nuclear units -- the highest percentage output of nuclear power ever produced on our system. It would have required more than 73 million gallons of oil to generate this much electricity, which represents an additional fuel cost of more than \$17 million. Our analysis of the energy situation indicates that the energy gap resulting from shutting down nuclear plants cannot be filled by strict conservation measures plus solar, geothermal, tidal and wind power. Experts agree that none of these new alternate energy sources can possibly be available in sufficient amount for 15 to 25 years, even if we invest all possible resources in their development.

We encourage you to study the issues in Proposition 15. Once you have studied the issues, you'll understand the seriousness of the situation. We need your help, and we urge you to vote and to vote NO to Proposition 15 on June 8.

If you would like additional information on the California initiative or on the importance of nuclear power to the NSP system, please write or call our Communications Department, 612/330-6368. We'll be happy to send you any information you need.

Sincerely,

D. F. McElroy

NEW ENGLAND ELECTRIC SYSTEM
20 TURNPIKE ROAD
WESTBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS 01581
TELEPHONE 617-366-9011

CABLE ADDRESS
NEELECSYS WTBO
TWX
710-390-0732

GUY W. NICHOLS
PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE

May 17, 1976

Dear California Shareholder:

This letter is written to urge you to vote no on proposition 15 — the anti-nuclear referendum question that will appear on your state election ballot on June 8.

If this ballot item is passed, it would in effect shut-down the nuclear power industry in California and provide great impetus for similar moves in states across the nation including the New England states in which our System does business.

Such an occurrence would have a negative impact on our nation and the New England region in particular.

About 13 percent of our System's electric energy requirements are now provided by nuclear power plants. Our present plans are to increase our nuclear capacity to more than 25 percent in the near future.

It is vital to the health of our economy, both in New England and the nation, that we continue on track with our nuclear power program. The experts agree that we are rapidly running out of oil worldwide. Coal, while abundant, is not presently a viable economic alternative for New England primarily because of transportation costs. And, while research is moving forward, the more exotic forms of energy such as solar, wind and geothermal are too far in the future to be of significant help in the balance of this century.

Nuclear power represents New England's only realistic alternative for low-cost energy needed to maintain our standard of living and to move us toward energy independence.

Prior to the referendum vote in June, you will be hearing many conflicting statements regarding nuclear power. We ask only that during the public debate you keep in mind the following facts. Nuclear power has an unmatched safety record. Of all the viable alternatives, nuclear power plants are the most environmentally compatible. Radioactive waste from a nuclear plant is small and controllable. Nuclear power is far less expensive than power produced in fossil-fired plants. Nuclear plants are as reliable as fossil-fired plants of similar size and age.

There are many people who are genuinely concerned about the nuclear question and much emotion has been generated during the public debate. We hope this letter has shed some light on the issues for you and that you will vote no on proposition 15.

If you would like further information on nuclear power, please write to us. We will try our best to provide satisfactory answers.

Sincerely,

