

AEC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL
(TEMPORARY FORM)

CONTROL NO: 3814

ENVIRO FILE

FROM: Dept of the Army St. Paul Dist. Corps of Eng. St. Paul, Minn 55101 Rodney E. Cox	DATE OF DOC: 7-7-72	DATE REC'D 7-12-72	LTR x	MEMO	RPT	OTHER
TO: D. R. Muller	ORIG 1 signed	CC	OTHER	SENT AEC PDR <u>x</u> SENT LOCAL PDR <u>x</u>		
CLASS: <u>U</u> PROP INFO	INPUT	NO CYS REC'D 1	DOCKET NO: 50-263			

DESCRIPTION:
Ltr re our 5-26-72 ltr...trans the following:

ENCLOSURES:
Comments on Draft Enviro Statement for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant.

ACKNOWLEDGED

PLANT NAMES: Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit # 1

(1 cy rec'd)

DO NOT REMOVE

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION 7-13-72 tod

BUTLER(L) W/ Copies	KNIEL(L) W/ Copies	VASSALLO(L) W/ Copies	ZIEMANN(L) W/ Copies	KNIGHTON (ENVIRO) W/ 4Copies
CLARK(L) W/ Copies	SCHWENCER(L) W/ Copies	H. DENTON W/ Copies	CHITWOOD(FM) W/ Copies	W/ Copies
GOLLER(L) W/ Copies	STOLZ(L) W/ Copies	SCHEMEL(L) W/ Copies	DICKER(ENVIRO) W/ Copies	W/ Copies

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

<u>REG FILES</u>	VOLLMER-L	KARAS-L L/A PWR	STELLO-L
AEC PDR	DENTON-L	MASON-L L/A BWR	ZIEMANN
REG OPER (2) ()	GRIMES-L	BROWN-L L/A PWR	
CGC-RM P-506	GAMMILL-L	WILSON-L L/A PWR	
MUNTZING & STAFF	KNIGHTON-ENVIRO	KARI-L L/A BWR	
GIAMBUSSO-L	DICKER-ENVIRO	SMITH-L L/A BWR	
BOYD-L-BWR	PROJ LDR ENVIRO:	GEARIN-L L/A BWR	
DEYOUNG-L-PWR		DIGGS-L L/A	
MULLER-L-ENVIRO	SALTZMAN-IND.	TEETS-L L/A	
SKOVHOLT-L-OPER	McDONALD-PLANS	GEARIN L/A ENVIRO	
KNUTH-L	NUSSBAUMER-FM	BRAITMAN-A/T	
MACCARY-L	SMILEY-FM	HARLESS-ENVIRO	
SCHROEDER-L	P. COLLINS-L	MOORE-L	

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1-LOCAL PDR Minneapolis, Minn.	1-NATIONAL LAB'S /BNWL	1-SAN/LA/NY--PDR
1-DTIE-(LAUGHLIN)	1-R. CARROLL-OC, GT	1-CHIEF WATER REACTORS
1-NSIC-(BUCHANAN)	1-R. CATLIN, A-170, GT	1-RD....E. HALL F-309 GT
1-ASLB-YORE/SARYE WOODWARD/H. ST.	1-CONSULTANT'S NEWMARK/BLUME/AGBABIAN	
1-C. MILES-C-459, GT	1-DR. GERALD S. LELLOUCHE	
16 CYS ACRS-HOLDING	BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LAB	



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ST. PAUL DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
1210 U. S. POST OFFICE & CUSTOM HOUSE
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55101

50-263

IN REPLY REFER TO
NCS-ED-PB

7 July 1972

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



Dear Mr. Muller:

Reference is made to your letter of 26 May 1972, (Docket No. 50-263) inclosing a copy of the draft environmental impact statement for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit No. 1, dated May 1972.

The statement has been reviewed. It appears to cover adequately the aspects of the environment which are affected by the proposal and which fall within our purview.

Sincerely yours,

for *Arthur E. Williams*
RODNEY E. COX
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

1 Incl
As stated

Copy furnished:
Mr. Timothy Atkeson
General Counsel
Council on Environmental Quality
Executive Office of the President
722 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

NOTE: You may be interested in the attached suggestions made by the reviewing biologist which you may wish to consider in preparing the final impact statement.

3814

II THE SITE

Considering the doubts raised about planting conifers, we wonder why another type of planting was not chosen.

V ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF PLANT OPERATION

There could be a tabular comparison of present and predicted effluent radionuclide concentrations, with Federal and State standards.

Transmission line environmental impacts do not appear to be included.

More adequate presentation of the (temperature) plume distribution could be given, from horizontal, vertical and seasonal perspectives.

For fish species temperature acclimation and tolerance curves for physiological parameters should be included.

Neither Table V-2 nor any other presents original or present alpha or beta counts.

What effect would the fog from cooling towers have on transpiration and other microclimate-sensitive life processes?

VIII SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

What is the life of the project?

What are the long-term health-related implications of radioactivity and other pollutant emissions?

XI ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSED ACTION AND COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES OF THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Might there be a need to limit power consumption and growth?

How would long-term rangers to public health of alternatives compare with those from the project?

GLOSSARY

A definition of "curie" could be included.

Factors for calculating exposure and dosage could be included with the conversion factors.

APPENDIX A

Charts should include half-lives of isotopes, since some are quite long.

Regulatory

File Cy.

