

Docket No. 50-247

MAR 11 1975

Mrs. Gail Franko  
176 Seward Street  
Buchanan, New York 10511

Dear Mrs. Franko:

I am pleased to respond to your letter of January 29, 1975, to the President which was referred to me for reply and in which you expressed concern over the proposed cooling tower construction and operation by Consolidated Edison at Indian Point Unit No. 2.

The requirement that Consolidated Edison operate the Indian Point Plant with a closed-cycle cooling system was arrived at by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in its Initial Decision of September 25, 1973, as a result of the position taken by the Hudson River Fishermen's Association, the New York State Attorney General, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff in the proceeding of Indian Point Unit No. 2. This proceeding involved a prolonged public hearing held in Croton-on-Hudson and Washington and it included over 10,000 pages of testimony from the licensee, the New York State Governor's Office, Citizens Committee for the Protection of the Environment, the Environmental Defense Fund, the above mentioned parties, and the NRC staff and limited appearances from the public. The Licensing Board reached that decision after weighing the environmental costs of the long-term impacts of the Plant's once-through cooling system on the striped bass fishery in the Hudson River, Long Island Sound, New Jersey and New England coasts versus the economic and environmental benefits of operation with an alternative closed-cycle cooling system. The impacts are expected to result from entrainment of fish eggs and larvae in the Indian Point Plant's cooling system and impingement of young-of-the-year juveniles on the cooling water intake screens, and not necessarily from thermal effects as discussed in the newspaper article referenced in your letter. Concerns over the public health and safety were also a part of the discussion in the hearing.

The Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board in its review of the hearing record supported the conclusion that Consolidated Edison operate Indian Point Unit No. 2 with a closed-cycle cooling system after May 1, 1979. Furthermore, in its Operating License DPR-26, Consolidated Edison

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	Secy Mail Facility
NRC PDR	75-2316
Local PDR	EHughes
EP-1 Reading	MGroff
NRR Reading	MJOestmann
ECase	GDicker
LVGossick	WRegan
AGiambusso	BJYoungblood
OELD	GKnighton
OIE (3)	MSlater
Gertter (DR-8223	<del>02-15</del> )

8110240095 750311  
PDR ADDCK 05000247  
H PDR

3/11/75

H  
2

OFFICE →	RL:EP-1	RL:EP-1	RL:AD/EP		
SURNAME →	MJOestmann:sh	GKNighton	DRM		
DATE →	3/6/75	3/7/75	3/7/75		

Mrs. Gail Franko

- 2 -

is permitted to make a timely application to the Commission to extend the interim operation of once-through cooling beyond the 1979 date or seek such other relief as may be appropriate, based on the empirical data collected from the licensee's ecological study program.

Although no specific closed-cycle cooling system was recommended by the Licensing and Appeal Boards, they required (as a part of the operating license) that Consolidated Edison submit a report recommending the preferred alternative closed-cycle cooling system. In accordance with this requirement, Consolidated Edison submitted a report entitled "Economic and Environmental Impacts of Alternative Closed-Cycle Cooling Systems at Indian Point Unit No. 2" dated December 1, 1974. In this report, Consolidated Edison recommended a natural-draft tower over 500 feet high as the preferred closed-cycle cooling system.

At the present time, no approval has been given to the natural-draft cooling tower design nor has a decision been made by the Commission as to the type of closed-cycle cooling system to be approved for installation at Indian Point Unit No. 2. The NRC staff will review information on various alternative closed-cycle cooling systems, including Consolidated Edison's report as well as other sources on the different alternatives.

The staff assessment of the alternative closed-cycle cooling systems will be available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20555, and in the Hendrick Hudson Free Library, 31 Albany Post Road, Montrose, New York 10548. The licensee's report on alternative closed-cycle cooling systems and the entire record of this proceeding are also in these public document rooms. They are also available at the New York State Office of Planning Services, 488 Broadway, Albany, New York 12207, and the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, 100 Church Street, New York, New York 10006.

We appreciate your concerns about the Indian Point facility and hope this information is of use to you. If we can be of further assistance, please feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely,

/s/

Daniel R. Muller, Assistant Director  
for Environmental Projects  
Division of Reactor Licensing

OFFICE >

SURNAME >

DATE >

FROM <b>Carl Franko</b> <b>Buchanan, H. F.</b>		CONTROL NUMBER <b>8223</b>	FILE LOCATION
		DATE OF DOCUMENT <b>1/29/75</b>	ACTION COMPLETION DEADLINE <b>2/28/75</b>
TO  <b>The President</b>		ACTION PROCESSING DATES Acknowledged _____ Interim Reply _____ Final <b>5/1 Multi: 5/14/75</b>	PREPARE FOR SIGNATURE OF: _____ Chairman _____ Director of Regulation <b>X</b> <b>RL</b>
DESCRIPTION <b>Ltr</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Copy <input type="checkbox"/> Other		REMARKS	
<b>Opposes erection of a cooling tower at Indian Point</b>          <b>Encl: newspaper article</b>          <b>SECY 75-2316</b>			
REFERRED TO	DATE	IS NOTIFICATION TO THE JCAE RECOMMENDED? _____	
<b>Gianbasso f/action</b>	<b>2/21/75</b>		
		Cys: <b>Case</b>	
		<b>Docket Files) 50-247</b>	
		<b>PDR</b>	
		<b>L.PDR</b>	

NO. 75-2316LOGGING DATE February 20, 1975**AEC SECRETARIAT**

TO: ☐ COMMISSIONER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: 2/20/75  
☐ GEN. MANAGER ☐ GEN. COUNSEL ☐ INFO. SERVICES  
☐ DIR. REGULATION ☐ PLAN. & ANAL. ☐ SECRETARY  
☒ Exec. Director for Operations

INCOMING FROM: Gail Franko176 Seward St.Buchanan, N. Y. 10511DATE: 1/29/75To: President FordSUBJECT: Opposed to the building of a cooling tower by Consolidated Edison at Indian Point☐ PREPARE REPLY FOR SIGNATURE OF:

- ☐ CHAIRMAN  
☐ COMMISSIONER  
☐ GM, DR, GC, PA, IS, SECY  
☐ SIGNATURE BLOCK OMITTED

☐ PLEASE RETURN ORIGINAL WITH RESPONSE

XX FOR DIRECT REPLY

XX SEND COPY OF REPLY TO:

XX SECY MAIL FACILITY (3)

- ☐ CHAIRMAN  
☐ COMMISSIONERS  
☐ SECRETARY

- ☐ FOR APPROPRIATE ACTION  
☐ FOR INFORMATION  
☐ FOR RECOMMENDATION

REMARKS: Original to D&SS

FOR THE COMMISSION: \_\_\_\_\_

WHEN SEPARATED FROM ENCLOSURES  
HANDLE THIS DOCUMENT AS

9 encl.

NRC

RECEIVED

'75 FEB 20 AM 9:24

January 29, 1975

Dear President Ford,

My family and I live in a small Westchester County village called Buchanan in New York State.

Also located in this village is a power plant owned by Con Edison called Indian Point.

The Atomic Energy Commission has ordered Con Edison to build a cooling tower so the hot water released by the plant won't kill the fish in the Hudson River.

In the last few years the river has been cleaned up considerably and the fish have been pretty abundant.

2/20 To Exec. Director for Operations for direct reply.  
Send 3 cys of reply to Secy Mail Facility.  
Original to D&SS.

8223

Rec'd Off. Dir.  
Date 2/24/75  
Time 11:05

NRC  
2:50 P  
3/21/75

Why should a small village such as ours and other outlying communities have to live under a cloud which this tower will produce and naturally the money which we will have to pay in the long run for the construction of this tower.

Enclosed is an article which was written in our local newspaper "The Evening Star" on January 28 which will explain I'm sure more clearly than a simple housewife such as myself could do.

I would appreciate any help or consideration you can give us with this problem.

Sincerely  
Hail Franks

# Council opposes cooling tower

By BILL WISSER  
Staff Reporter

Don't build a huge cooling tower at Indian Point, said Peekskill's Common Council, unless there is no alternative.

The council last night opposed the 565 feet high tower that the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) has ordered at Con Edison's power plant in Buchanan.

The atomic plant sucks from the river huge amounts of Hudson water. Presently the plant dumps the water — which has been heated to about 100 degrees — back in the Hudson. Many ecologists charge that the hot water kills marine life.

So the AEC ordered a cooling tower built to dissipate into the atmosphere, "surplus heat."

The proposed tower, as high as a 50 story building and as wide as a football field is long, will produce a plume-like cloud. In some weather conditions the cloud will blanket miles of countryside.

"This structure would have an adverse appearance and effect in our area," said the council.

"Its construction and operating expense will be astronomical and a direct charge on the consumer. It does not appear from the information presently available . . . that the construction and operation of this tower is an absolute necessity."

Two studies now in preparation may offer alternatives. One study is a Con Ed financed investigation of marine life and water temperature.

If the tower is built now,

the council said, "and alternatives are developed as a result of this study, large sums of money will be wasted — all of which will have to be paid for by the customers of the company."

David Ornstein, Peekskill Community Development Agency executive director, has proposed another study. Don't dissipate heat energy, says Ornstein. Use the heat to warm streets, sidewalks, buildings and marinas. A

federal agency has given Ornstein \$30,000 to investigate the idea.

Ornstein said last night that he has met with Con Ed officials who expressed interest in the heat recycling concept.

The water is not radioactive, he stressed. It is the secondary coolant, not the primary coolant which surrounds the reactor and is indeed radioactive and deadly.

The council recommended that Buchanan refuse to make a zoning variance apparently needed to build the huge tower.

The council also urged people to help stop the tower by writing their congressmen. The city manager was instructed to inform the AEC, the Environmental Protection Agency, and elected federal and state officials of the council's opposition.