

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

November 22/72

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION)

PETITION TO INTERVENE in a Public Hearing on the Proposed Issuance of an Operating License for Nuclear Unit # 3 of Consolidated Edison's Indian Point Nuclear Complex in NW Westchester County, New York
DOCKET NO. 50-286

Secretary
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Att: Chief, Public Proceedings Staff

I am filing herewith a Petition, accompanied by a supporting Affidavit, to take part as an Intervenor in a Public Hearing on a proposed AEC Operating License for Consolidated Edison's Indian Point Nuclear Reactor # 3, following my participation in August 1969 as an Intervenor in the AEC Hearing at Montrose, New York on a Construction License for the same Nuclear Generating Unit.

The reasons for my present desire to intervene follow. As in 1969, my natural concern for the health and safety of my immediate family - resident in New York City within the endangered accident and pollution radius of this enormous plant - still forms the primary motive for my intervention:

1. The proposed addition of Nuclear Unit 3's 935-megawatts to the planned nuclear power of Units 1 and 2 would bring the total power of the Indian Point nuclear complex to 2,103,000,000 watts: an aggregate-larger than any existing American nuclear plant - with which, it is important to remember, no actual technical working experience has ever been had.
2. In allowing the siting of such a nuclear complex so close to the largest city in our country - New York - the AEC has grossly ignored the recommendations of its own safety experts, as will be shown in my Affidavit.
3. No actual experience exists on which the National Environmental Protection Agency can base a credible environmental "impact statement," as the NEPA Act requires.
4. The \$10 Million Fire of Nov. 4/71 at Indian Point # 2 - kept out of the news for 10 days and admitted to be the work of an arsonist - points to the danger of more such acts of sabotage to other parts of the plant, with resultant widespread destruction.
5. AEC promises to surrounding populations of "minimal radiation emissions"(at the "fraction of natural background radiation" specified in present directives) offer no assurance of actual protection from damage; with what we now know of the enormous difference between the effects of natural background radiation and those of nuclear stack gas effluents, however small, when inhaled or absorbed internally by the people who live around the plant.

All of the facts above require full and public discussion before any such plant license to operate should be allowed.

20 copies of Petition & Affidavit are enclosed, to be forwarded to:

The attorneys to Consolidated Edison
The Regulatory Staff of the AEC
and other interested parties

Mary Hays Weik
166 Second Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10003

8111090336 721122
PDR ADDCK 05000286
G PDR

November 22/72

Accompanying Petition to Intervene in
a Public Hearing on Issuance of an Operating
License for Nuclear Unit # 3 of Consolidated
Edison's Indian Point Nuclear Complex
in NW Westchester Co., NY. DOCKET NO. 50-286

A F F I D A V I T

I, MARY HAYS WEIK of New York City- where I and my immediate family live within the area endangered by any serious accident at the great Indian Point nuclear plant - state my reasons for petitioning to intervene in a Public Hearing on an Operating License for Indian Point Nuclear Unit # 3 to be as follows:

1. The total power which would be achieved at the Indian Point Nuclear Complex by the addition of the # 3 Nuclear Reactor would reach the enormous sum of 2,103,000,000 watts - a potential source of accident and pollution greater than any now existing in America, at a distance of only 24 miles from the largest city in our nation. No working experience whatever has been had with nuclear complexes of this size (as was pointed out by engineers of standing during the recent discovery of damaged nuclear fuel in 4 large U.S. power reactors - including Indian Point Unit # 2), and their behavior under abnormal conditions would therefore be completely unknown.
2. In allowing the siting of so enormous a nuclear complex - 10 times larger than the plant size originally proposed - the AEC has ignored the recommendations of its own safety experts, in their Siting Guidelines (Gov't pub'n TID 14844 - CALCULATIONS OF DISTANCE FACTORS FOR POWER AND TESTING REACTOR SITES, pth, Mar. 23/62 and never superseded since). The largest nuclear plant then existing (Dresden I, 630-megs.) was allotted in this manual a distance from a small city (25,000) of nearly 10 miles. The Indian Point complex, ^{suburban} more than 3 times that size, is directly contiguous to Westchester County's population of nearly a million. Yet the siting manual explicitly states that the "distance to very large cities may have to be greater than those suggested by these guides . . . "
3. Because of the lack of actual experience with such large nuclear installations, no required NEPA environmental "impact statement" would be able to make a credible evaluation of the actual effect of a nuclear plant of Indian Point's total size.
4. The very destructive fire of Nov. 4/71 at Indian Point # 2 (see N.Y. Times of Nov. 14/71) - assessed by local authorities as causing at least \$10 Million damages, kept out of the news for 10 days, and publicly admitted to be the work of an arsonist - underlines the chance that future acts of sabotage may endanger the total plant. They could produce a holocaust whose effects could spread to the whole tristate New York Metropolitan area - including the island of Manhattan, from which evacuation would be physically impossible.
5. Present AEC promises of "minimal radiation releases" of "a fraction of natural background radiation" offer no actual assurance to surrounding populations of protection from physical and genetic damage - because of the special concentration of nuclear stack gas effluents, however small, when internally inhaled or absorbed by the people who live around the plants. No amount of technical or engineering improvements can entirely prevent this fact.

(Notarized:)



Notary Public, State of New York
No. 31-5345-00 Clerk in New York Co.
Commission Expires March 31, 1973

(Signed)



Mary Hays Weik
166 Second Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10003