DOCKETED
USAEC
APR 2 1969
Office of the Secretary
Public Proceedings
Staff

DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-286

CONSERVATION FOR GOOD LIVING

Federated Conservationists of Westchester County

10 Whitehall Road
Eastchester, N.Y. 10709

RECEIVED
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
'69 MAR 31 AM 11 34
OFFICE OF
HEARING EXAMINERS

March 26, 1969

Mr. Samuel W. Jensch, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Dear Mr. Jensch:

Regretfully none of our accredited officers could be present at the March 25th hearing in Montrose which makes it necessary for us to take advantage of your suggestion to mail our statement to you for consideration at the evidentiary hearing for inclusion into the transcript.

This Federation of Conservation groups has not taken an official position against nuclear power plants regardless of where they might be located because we recognize that the age of nuclear power is here and will continue to expand with the passage of time. In this light we also recognize that the constantly increasing need for power in the Greater New York area will have to be met and that more power producing facilities will be required and that some of these will have to be of the nuclear reactor type.

What does concern us deeply is the planned proliferation of these facilities in a limited area before we can be certain of the effect of these plants on on the surrounding area. If we could specifically pinpoint a positive result of such proliferation in advance on the river, the soil, the atmosphere and on the population as well there would be no problem. In the normal course of events we would expect that our scientific studies and the opinions of the specialists who devote all their time to nuclear energy would provide the data needed to support the claim of harmlessness of expanded nuclear power production facilities. But, unfortunately, we are far from finding any unanimity of opinion by our scientists...and this is what must trouble any intelligent person.

We do know what damage was caused to the Hudson River population a few years ago as a result of thermally related conditions created by the first plant at Indian Point. This fish destruction was reduced considerably but it has not been entirely eliminated. The second plant may create a repeat of this problem and there is the liklihood that it might be worse than before. This would mean more time before the renewed problem is alleviated but meanwhile the third reactor would be inproduction with the possibility of a more exaggerated repeat of the fish kill which in turn would have to be eliminated. We feel these problems should be anticipated and design corrections be made before the damage can come about.

8111070284 690401
PDR ADOCK 05000286
G PDR

CONSERVATION FOR GOOD LIVING

Federated Conservationists of Westchester County

Meanwhile, it can be assumed that there will be a continuing increase in the temperatures of the waters of the Hudson as each new plant comes into operation unless steps are taken to cool the water outflow before it leaves the plant. From an ecological viewpoint it is imperative that temperature increase be prevented for unless it is there will unquestionably be a marked and undesirable change in the marine growth of the River with its consequent adverse results on the fish population. At this point we have no solid guidelines as to probable results of power plant proliferation on the River if present approved procedures are followed.

Of even more importance is the possible cumulative effect of these plants on the atmosphere and then in its turn on the lives of the population in the surrounding area. If there is the slightest possibility that there may be side effects on the health of the people then there should be no construction until the conditions that pose these threats, if there are any, are removed.

Then we must consider the ever present threat of nuclear accidents and what permanent damage might be done to theenvironment in this metropolitan area. We are aware of the many such accidents which have occurred in plants throughout the United States - with one being serious enough to be closed down permanently. The big question here is what may happen if there is a cluster of nuclear plants and one of them suffers an accident ? And in such a situation can we be certain there would not be a chain reaction that would involve the other plants ?

Finally, we do firmly believe that thisproblem should not be considered on a piecemeal basis but rather on the full complex of plants which are now on the planning board for the Montrose-Buchanan area. We realize that such a procedure would result in a delay in construction. However, we do not make the suggestion merely to gain a time delay but rather hope that the problem will be reviewed in its entirety now with all scientific research concentrated on means of eliminating potential dangers by establishing requirements for adequate initial construction which would solve in advance the means to keep the temperature of the water outflow down to levels that would not impair the present ecology of the river and that the possibility that contaminants might be released into the atmosphere would be reduced to zero percent.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our viewpoint and we hope our comments will add to a fuller understanding of the problems involved.

Yours very sincerely
Federated Conservationists
of Westchester County, Inc.

Henry C. Schlichting