



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION II

26 FEDERAL PLAZA

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007

FEB 15 1980

Dr. Robert Geckler
Division of Site Safety and
Environmental Analysis
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Dr. Geckler:

We have reviewed the final environmental impact statement (EIS) for selection of the preferred closed cycle cooling system at Indian Point Unit No. 3, and remain in general agreement with the conclusions reached in this document. However, we have determined not to provide you with detailed comments on the various issues addressed in the EIS since we expect that many of them will be resolved at EPA's ongoing adjudicatory hearing concerning the Indian Point and other Hudson River power plants. Moreover, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is in possession of testimony submitted by EPA for this proceeding that details our position on the engineering aspects, and on the economic and non-water quality environmental impacts associated with installation and operation of a closed cycle cooling tower system at Indian Point Unit No. 3.

Your response to our previous comments on radiological impacts has been noted, and we are interested in reviewing the staff's assessment of conformance with 10 CFR 50. However, since it appears that the predicted waste releases for the preferred cooling system will fall within the standards set by 40 CFR 190 for uranium fuel cycle activities (which are more stringent than 10 CFR 50), we are satisfied that the project's radiological effects will be acceptable.

Any questions you or your staff may have concerning the litigation now in progress should be directed to Jonathan Strong of Region II's Water Enforcement Branch at (212) 264-4928.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the final EIS.

Sincerely,

Anne Norton Miller, Director
Office of Federal Activities

COOL
EIS-10

D

8002220

325