

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20515

June 1, 1972

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
1717 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20545

Re: Consolidated Edison Company
of New York Inc. (Indian
Point Unit No. 2)
Docket No. 50-247

Gentlemen:

As a Congressman representing a District which lies along the Hudson River, I am writing to comment on the AEC's draft environmental impact statement on Indian Point No. 2. I was shocked to see that the annual loss of striped bass "may be as high as 15% to 20% from direct effects of plant operation." These figures become more startling when the draft points out that they will apply to other fish as well as the striped bass.

Losses of fish from the Hudson of this magnitude are simply unacceptable. The Hudson is a great estuarine fishery. It is invaluable for the recreational pleasure which it gives to the millions who live along its banks. It has great commercial value as the spawning and nursery ground for fish, most particularly the striped bass, which populate Long Island Sound, and the Atlantic waters from Montauk to Cape May. All government agencies must make every effort to maintain and enhance that fishery.

I am also perturbed that the draft statement gives only a partial picture of the situation in the Hudson. The AEC when writing impact statements must take into account the entire environment on which the proposed plant will have an effect. This was clearly the intent of Congress in passing the National Environmental Policy Act: each project is to be analyzed in terms of the particular environment on which it will have an impact.

Rec'd Off. Dir. of Reg.

Date 6/5/72

Time 1:15

DR. 4571


8111200277 720620
PDR ADOCK 05000247
U PDR

In the case of Indian Point No. 2, this requires an analysis of the other plants which will be operating on the River in the next two years -- Bowline Point and Roseton. These plants will also withdraw large quantities of water from the Hudson -- hundreds of thousands of gallons a minute -- and heat it substantially before discharging it again into the River. This will add to the devastating effect on the Hudson fishery which the draft environmental statement foresees at Indian Point. If the AEC fails to consider these effects it will be doing a disservice to the public as well as failing to address a major threat to the Hudson River in coherent and common sense terms. How can we talk about Indian Point No. 2 as if the other plants did not exist?

It seems to me inevitable that Con Edison will be required to build cooling towers at Indian Point. We must accept that as the price for saving the Hudson and its fishery. The alternative is to treat one of the great rivers of America as a cooling sluice for a utility and in the process sacrifice the vast natural resource of the Hudson's aquatic life. That is not an acceptable solution. I urge the AEC to require that Con Edison install cooling towers on the fastest practicable schedule. Moreover, it is important that such towers be constructed with silhouette as low as possible so that we do not have more towers in the environs of the Hudson Highlands that break the horizon line.

Everyone is concerned to see that we protect the environment as well as provide power. It is imperative that the AEC pursue its environmental mandate with the same vigor with which it has promoted nuclear power.

Sincerely,



JOHN G. DOW
Member of Congress

JGD:kjs

FROM
Rep. John G. Bow (N.Y.)

CONTROL NUMBER
4571

FILE LOCATION

DATE OF DOCUMENT
6/1/72

ACTION COMPLETION DEADLINE
6/7/72

TO
USABC

ACTION PROCESSING DATES
Acknowledged _____
Interim Report _____
Final 12/1/72 1/1/72

PREPARE FOR SIGNATURE OF:

Chairman

Director of Regulation

DESCRIPTION **Ltr** Original Copy Other

Comments on the draft environmental statement on Indian Point 2 and on the effect on the aquatic life of the Hudson River and urges the ABC to require that Con Ed install cooling towers

REMARKS

13604

REFERRED TO DATE
Giambusco f/action **6/5/72**

IS NOTIFICATION TO THE JCAE RECOMMENDED? _____

Cys:
Bloch Case
FDR (50-247)


[Handwritten signature]

FROM

MR. JOHN G. BOW (J.G.B.)

DATE OF DOCUMENT

6/1/72

DATE RECEIVED

6/17/72

CONTROL NUMBER

13604

TO

MR. BOW

SUSPENSE DATE

6/17 1972

FILE CODE

CLASSIFICATION

Series: _____
Copy _____ of _____

REPLY DATES

Acknowledge _____

Interim _____

Final _____

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

 Appropriate HandlingDESCRIPTION: LTR Original Copy Other**COMMENTING ON THE AEC'S DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 2 (CONSOLIDATED DESIGN CO. OF NEW YORK INC.)**

PREPARE FOR SIGNATURE OF:

 CHAIRMAN DIV./OFFICE DIRECTOR GENERAL MANAGER ASST. GENERAL MANAGER _____

REMARKS:

ENCLOSURES

REFERRED TO

DATE

RECEIVED BY

DATE

DIR. OF REG.

6/2

REPLY PREPARED BY: RYANSON

O'NEILL

6/20

OCM ADMIN UNIT

FOR DISPATCH

INFORMATION COPIES SENT TO:

 CHAIRMAN GENERAL MANAGER _____ _____ _____ _____

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMUNICATIONS CONTROL

U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

FORM HQ-284


(4-68)

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20515

OFFICIAL BUSINESS



U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
1717 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20545