

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.

15 WEST 44TH STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036

212 869-0150

Regulatory File Cy.

March 12, 1973

Washington Office
1710 N STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036
202 783-5710

West Coast Office
664 HAMILTON AVENUE
PALO ALTO, CALIF. 94301
415 327-1080

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Stephen P. Duggan, Esq.
Chairman
James Marshall, Esq.
Vice Chairman
Dr. Dean E. Abrahamson
Mrs. Louis Auchincloss
Boris I. Bittker, Esq.
John T. Booth, Esq.
Frederick A. Collins, Jr., Esq.
Dr. Rene J. Dubos
James B. Frankel, Esq.
Robert W. Gilmore
Dr. Joshua Lederberg
Ruby G. Martin, Esq.
Anthony Mazzocchi
Michael McIntosh
John B. Oakes
Dr. Gifford B. Pinchot
John R. Robinson, Esq.
Laurance Rockefeller
J. Willard Roosevelt
David Sive, Esq.
Dr. George M. Woodwell
Edwin M. Zimmerman, Esq.
John H. Adams, Esq.
Executive Director

Mr. Daniel R. Muller, Assistant
Director for Environmental Projects
Directorate of Licensing
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545


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

Dear Mr. Muller:

I have recently received a copy of Carl L. Newman's letter to you of March 1, 1973 concerning the environmental technical specifications for the Indian Point 2 plant.

Obviously, large portions of these proposed technical specifications are based on positions presently being contested by the Hudson River Fishermen's Association and the Regulatory Staff of the AEC in the proceeding concerning Con Edison's application for an operating license for Indian Point 2. The Fishermen are as opposed to the adoption of those positions as the basis for technical specification as they are opposed to their adoption as the basis for an operating license.

My question now is what course of action you intend to follow. Will any proposal for technical specifications be made before the initial decision of the ASLB in Indian Point 2 settles issues of the present controversy? If a proposal for technical specification is to be drawn up, will it rely on the Con Edison position or that of the Regulatory Staff? How may HRFA make its position known to your office in the most practical and



811210047 730312
PDR ADOCK 05000247
PDR

1730

Mr. Daniel R. Muller
Washington, D. C. 20545
March 12, 1973

effective manner?

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Yours sincerely,



Angus Macbeth
Attorney for Hudson River
Fishermen's Association

AM/sp

cc: Samuel W. Jensch, Esq.
Mr. R. B. Briggs
Dr. John C. Geyer
Myron Karman, Esq.
Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
J. Bruce MacDonald, Esq.
Honorable Louis J. Lefkowitz
Mr. Frank W. Karas
Leonard M. Trosten, Esq.
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.

15 WEST 44TH STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036

212 869-0150

Washington Office
1710 N STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036
202 783-5710

West Coast Office
664 HAMILTON AVENUE
PALO ALTO, CALIF. 94301
415 327-1080

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Stephen P. Duggan, Esq.
Chairman
James Marshall, Esq.
Vice Chairman
Dr. Dean E. Abrahamson
Mrs. Louis Auchincloss
Boris I. Bittker, Esq.
John T. Booth, Esq.
Frederick A. Collins, Jr., Esq.
Dr. Rene J. Dubos
James B. Frankel, Esq.
Robert W. Gilmore
Dr. Joshua Lederberg
Ruby G. Martin, Esq.
Anthony Mazzocchi
Michael McIntosh
John B. Oakes
Dr. Gifford B. Pinchot
John R. Robinson, Esq.
Laurance Rockefeller
J. Willard Roosevelt
David Sive, Esq.
Dr. George M. Woodwell
Edwin M. Zimmerman, Esq.
John H. Adams, Esq.
Executive Director

March 12, 1973

Mr. Daniel R. Muller, Assistant
Director for Environmental Projects
Directorate of Licensing
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

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

Dear Mr. Muller:

I have recently received a copy of Carl L. Newman's letter to you of March 1, 1973 concerning the environmental technical specifications for the Indian Point 2 plant.

Obviously, large portions of these proposed technical specifications are based on positions presently being contested by the Hudson River Fishermen's Association and the Regulatory Staff of the AEC in the proceeding concerning Con Edison's application for an operating license for Indian Point 2. The Fishermen are as opposed to the adoption of those positions as the basis for technical specification as they are opposed to their adoption as the basis for an operating license.

My question now is what course of action you intend to follow. Will any proposal for technical specifications be made before the initial decision of the ASLB in Indian Point 2 settles issues of the present controversy? If a proposal for technical specification is to be drawn up, will it rely on the Con Edison position or that of the Regulatory Staff? How may HRFA make its position known to your office in the most practical and




1730

Mr. Daniel R. Muller
Washington, D. C. 20545
March 12, 1973

effective manner?

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Yours sincerely,



Angus Macbeth
Attorney for Hudson River
Fishermen's Association

AM/sp

cc: Samuel W. Jensch, Esq.
Mr. R. B. Briggs
Dr. John C. Geyer
Myron Karman, Esq.
Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
J. Bruce MacDonald, Esq.
Honorable Louis J. Lefkowitz
Mr. Frank W. Karas
Leonard M. Trosten, Esq.
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel