

FROM

Dep. Clark MacGregor (Miss.)

CONTROL NUMBER

110

ACTION COMPLETION DEADLINE

4/14/69

DATE OF DOCUMENT

4/2/69

LOCATION

TO

Comm. Ransy

ACTION PROCESSING DATES

Acknowledged _____

Interim Report _____

Final _____

INFORMATIONAL COPY DISTRIBUTION

___ Chairman	___ ADNS	___ COM
___ GM	___ ADA	___ SS
___ Dep. Dir.	___ OGC	___ SLR
___ A. D.	___ RL	___ ML

DESCRIPTION

lty

 Original Copy Other

Ltr in Mrs. David R. Carlson expressing concern re dumping of radioactive wastes into the Mississippi River from the Monticello plant

EM 62658

REMARKS

For signature of Comm. Ransy
"Dear Mr. MacGregor"

50-263

REFERRED TO

DATE

Morris f/action

4/9/69

Cys: BPrice Shesher

Buck TSM (50-263)

Mann

Henderson

Dean

Westers

DO NOT DETACH THIS COPY

DIRECTOR OF REGULATION
COMMUNICATIONS CONTROLForm HQ-32 (7-64)
U. S. AEC

L
DR-2110

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

4-4
(Date)

TO: *GM Reg*

For appropriate handling

GM (Cong) Rpl Reply for ^{*Ramen's*} Chairman's signature

For information: GM _____ Commissioners _____ DR _____

Remarks _____

Julius H. Rubin
For the Chairman

CLARK MACGREGOR
THIRD DISTRICT, MINNESOTA

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
409 CANNON OFFICE BUILDING
PHONE: 225-2871

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
DAVID N. KROGSENG

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

DISTRICT OFFICE:
120 U.S. COURTHOUSE
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
PHONE: 334-2173

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE:
MISS MARYELLEN SMITH

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20515

April 2, 1969

DR-2110

Mr. James T. Ramey
Acting Chairman
Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Dear Mr. Ramey:

Enclosed is a letter I recently received from
a constituent.

I would appreciate receiving answers to the
questions asked in Mrs. Carlson's letter.

Sincerely,

Clark MacGregor
Clark MacGregor, M.C.

CM:cnc
enc.

✓
DR-2110

Rec'd Off. Dir. of Reg.
Date 4/7/69
Time 2:00

Received in Office of J. T. Ramey
Date 4/13/69 File 502

4743 Chatham Road
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55421
March 25, 1969

The Honorable Clark MacGregor
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Sir:

I am very concerned by reports I have been reading in The Minneapolis Star in regard to the probable pollution of our drinking water by the NSP nuclear-powered plant being built at Monticello, Minnesota. Enclosed is a photostat copy of two of the articles which appeared recently. Many questions have come to mind and perhaps you are in a position to find the answers for me and take action, if possible, to prevent NSP from discharging radioactive wastes into the river.

You will note in the enclosed article reference is made to a 1965 study conducted in nine counties in Oregon which border the Columbia River downstream from the Hanford, Washington atomic energy plant. Was this a government study and have there been any similar studies and what conclusions have been drawn from them? If the statements made in this article in regard to the higher cancer rate are true, it is hard to understand how the Atomic Energy Commission can claim there is no danger to the populace.

On a recent television program entitled "What are we doing to our World", the problems of disposal of radioactive wastes from nuclear plants was discussed. In addition to the wastes put in the river, evidently some also has to be buried and will remain radioactive for 1,000 years. In light of these facts, it is hard to understand why more of these plants are being planned. I realize there is a need for more electricity to meet the demands of a growing population, but what is wrong with the conventional power plants. What argument is there in favor of nuclear plants?

I assume permission for these plants and supervision of them is controlled by the Atomic Energy Commission. Does anyone or group have any control over the Atomic Energy Commission? Does the President? In another article I read it states, "According to lawyers for both the federal commission and the state agency, congressional action has insulated the Atomic Energy Commission from any outside interference on policy matters". This is in reference to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency challenging the AEC in regard to disposal of radioactive wastes at Monticello. Perhaps those affected directly should be the ones to decide whether they want to drink radioactive water or not as I am not convinced the Atomic Energy Commission is infallible. There were a lot of dead sheep out West because someone or group made an error in testing nerve gas. Does the Atomic Energy Commission really know what effect extra amounts of radiation taken in drinking water will have on my grandchildren?

From any reports I have heard on studies conducted on Japanese who received radiation but were not killed in the initial bombing in World War II, none benefited from extra radiation. We already have one nuclear plant at Elk River, Minnesota which I assume puts some radioactive wastes into the river. Then there is the one currently being built at Monticello, and I understand NSP is planning two more plants north of Red Wing in the 1970's. It seems the combined radioactive wastes from these plants would be bound to raise the level of radiation in the river considerably downstream.

In view of all the concern in our land today for cleaning up America and preserving our natural resources, I do not believe NSP should be allowed to pollute the Mississippi River particularly with radioactive wastes.

Any information you can secure for me in regard to my questions would be most appreciated. Thank you for your help in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. David R. Carlson

Mrs. David R. Carlson

Plan to Discharge Radioactive Wastes Into River Opposed

By JIM SHOOP
Minneapolis Star Staff Writer

There are no "safe" levels of human exposure to radiation and the planned discharge of radioactive wastes in the Mississippi River from the Monticello, Minn., nuclear electric plant should be prohibited, a University of Minnesota zoologist said Wednesday.

Prof. Charles W. Huver made the recommendation in a meeting with John Badalich, director of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and several state legislators.

The Monticello plant, now under construction by Northern States Power Co., is scheduled to go into operation early in 1970. The company has maintained that the plant will be operated in a completely safe manner and that there will be no danger to public health from radioactive wastes.

Huver said later he told the group that neither the radiation control standards of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission nor those recommended by the Pollution Control Agency's consultant, Dr. Ernest C. Tsvoglou, "are any guarantee of public safety."

Tsvoglou recommended that Minnesota set standards three times more stringent than those of the Atomic Energy Commission. Both sets of standards assume that there are levels of exposure below which there is no harm to public health and safety.

Huver said there is "mounting evidence" in biological studies over the past 10 years that tritium, the most predominant radioactive isotope found in wastes from nuclear power plant reactors, causes cancer in animals.

He noted that James H. Smith, Jr., nuclear engineer for General Electric, which is building the Monticello reactor, has estimated that 30,000 curies of tritium will be discharged into the Mississippi during the plant's first year of operation.

"It would be irresponsible for persons charged with the protection of public health or with providing consultation on the safety aspects of nuclear discharges to ignore the

He also cited a 1965 study which showed that the cancer death rate in nine counties in Oregon which border the Columbia River downstream from the Hanford, Washington atomic energy plant was 53 percent higher than the rest of the state over a six-year period.

(The Hanford facility is several times larger and discharges much more waste than is contemplated at the Monticello plant.)

There is no practical method of removing tritium from the liquid discharges of nuclear plants, Huver said. He

biological effects of tritium . . ." Huver said.

When taken into the body in sufficient quantities, as, for example, in drinking water, "it can produce a variety of biological damage including chromosome breakage, genetic mutation, growth inhibition, cancer" and the death of cells and organs, Huver maintains.

In other words, it can cause serious physical and mental deformities, Huver said.

He said Tsvoglou's recommended standards, though tighter than the Atomic Energy Commission's, still will not be sufficient to adequately protect the total environment of man, plants and animals.

"His standards are based on what the power company estimates that the plant will emit," Huver said. "He starts from the general assumption that the air and water should hold whatever the plant emits."

Panel Says A-Plant Poses Cancer Threat

A nuclear power plant at Monticello, Minn., poses the threat of cancer and genetic mutations if its radioactive discharges are dumped into the Mississippi River, a DFL Party task force said Saturday.

the Monticello plant is only 34 miles upstream from drinking water intakes for the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area.

The group asked the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to "absolutely and permanently deny Northern States Power Co. permission to dump any radioactive wastes into the river or into the air."

The task force, headed by Dr. Phillip G. Thompson, chemist for Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co., and by Lawrence D. Cohen, St. Paul lawyer, noted that

Pollution of the river, it said, threatens all river communities downstream.

It noted "a dramatic increase in the incidence of leukemia and other forms of cancer for people downstream" after the Hanford reactor on the Columbia River began operation.

Use of disposal methods approved by the Atomic Energy Commission, the DFL group said, would raise costs at the Monticello plant by only 25 cents per year for the average customer.