

ALTERNATE DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL
(TEMPORARY FORM)

CONTROL NO: 5529

FILE: ENVIRO

FROM: United States Enviro Protection Agency New York, N. Y. 10007 Gerald M. Hansler		DATE OF DOC 7-17-73	DATE REC'D 7-18-73	LTR x	MEMO	RPT	OTHER
TO: L. Manning Muntzing		ORIG 1	CC	OTHER	SENT AEC PDR x SENT LOCAL PDR x		
CLASS	UNCLASS x	PROP INFO	INPUT	NO CYS REC'D 1	DOCKET NO: 50-410		
DESCRIPTION: Ltr furnishing comments on final environmental statement.....				ENCLOSURES: ACKNOWLEDGED DO NOT REMOVE			
PLANT NAME: Nine Mile Point #2							

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION

7-19-73 LB

BUTLER(L) W/ Copies	SCHWENCER(L) W/ Copies	ZIEMANN(L) W/ Copies	✓REGAN(E) W/4 Copies
✓CLARK(L) W/1 Copies (info)	STOLZ(L) W/ Copies	DICKER(E) W/ Copies	W/ Copies
GOLLER(L) W/ Copies	VASSALLO(L) W/ Copies	KNIGHTON(E) W/ Copies	W/ Copies
KNIEL(L) W/ Copies	SCHEMEL(L) W/ Copies	YOUNGBLOOD(E) W/ Copies	W/ Copies

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

REG FILE ✓AEC PDR OGC, ROOM P-506A ✓MUNTZING/STAFF CASE GIAMBUSSO BOYD ✓MOORE (L)(BWR) DEYOUNG(L)(PWR) SKOVHOLT (L) P. COLLINS	<u>TECH REVIEW</u> HENDRIE SCHROEDER MACCARY KNIGHT PAWLICKI SHAO STELLO HOUSTON NOVAK ROSS IPPOLITO TEDESCO LONG LAINAS ✓BENAROYA VOLLMER	DENTON GRIMES GAMMILL KASTNER ✓BALLARD SPANGLER <u>ENVIRO</u> MULLER DICKER KNIGHTON YOUNGBLOOD REGAN PROJECT LDR <u>HARLESS</u>	<u>LIC ASST</u> BROWN (E) DIGGS (L) ✓GEARIN (L) GOULBOURNE (L) LEE (L) MAIGRET (L) SERVICE (L) ✓SHEPPARD (E) SMITH (L) TEETS (L) WADE (E) WILLIAMS (E) WILSON (L)	<u>A/T IND</u> BRAITMAN SALTZMAN <u>PLANS</u> MCDONALD DUBE <u>INFO</u> C. MILES
---	--	---	--	---

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

✓1 - LOCAL PDR Oswego, N. Y.	✓(1) [REDACTED] - NATIONAL LAB'S ANL	1-PDR-SAN/LA/NY
✓1 - DTIE(ABERNATHY)	1-R.Schoonmaker, OC, GT, D-323	1-GERALD LELLOUCHE
1 - NSIC(BUCHANAN)	✓1-R. CATLIN, E-256-GT	BROOKHAVEN NAT. LAB
1 - ASLB(YORE/SAYRE/ WOODARD/"H" ST.	1-CONSULTANT'S NEWMARK/BLUME/AGBABIAN	1-AGMED(WALTER KOESTER RM-C-427-GT
16 - CYS ACRS HOLDING	1-GERALD JULRIKSON...ORNL	1-RD..MULLER..F-309 GT



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION II
26 FEDERAL PLAZA
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007

50-410

JUL 17 1973



Mr. L. Manning Muntzing
Director of Regulation
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Dear Mr. Muntzing:

This office has reviewed the final environmental impact statement for the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit 2. All the radiological questions raised by EPA in our review of the draft statement have been answered to our satisfaction in the final statement. However, we still have a problem with the water quality impact of the once through cooling system planned for the facility.

Despite the results of the applicant's thermal model, it still appears doubtful that the discharge will comply with New York State regulations for thermal discharges. This is due to the potential for interaction between the Nine Mile plume and the plume from the FitzPatrick plant. Infrared imagery studies of the Unit 1 plume show that contrary to conclusions in the final statement, the discharge plumes will tend to parallel the shoreline and thus to interact with each other. The result could be an affected area larger than that allowed under New York State regulations.

New York State regulations also require that thermal discharges must be confined to the epilimnetic region. Our information indicates that the discharge from Nine Mile Point Unit 2 may be to the hypolimnion a large part of the time in violation of those regulations. We feel that sufficient evidence of thermal stratification in the lake exists to warrant further investigation of this possibility.

A significant problem related to the use of the once through cooling system is the destruction of fish and other aquatic organisms from impingement and entrainment. Destruction of aquatic life from impingement alone promises to be extensive. If the data in Table 5-12 (Fish Impingement Rates) are extrapolated, they present the possibility of 75,000 to 100,000 fish killed per day. Considering that there are no significant operational differences between Units 1, 2 and the FitzPatrick plant, quantities of fish killed should be comparable at all three. This combined effect adds to the significance of the problem.



20 27
28


[The main body of the page contains several paragraphs of text that are extremely faint and illegible due to low contrast and significant noise. The text appears to be organized into approximately five distinct sections or paragraphs, but the individual words and sentences cannot be discerned.]

In light of these problems, the AEC staff has recommended that the construction permit for Unit 2 be issued with several conditions. Those conditions pertinent to the biological impact of the once through cooling system are: (1) biological sampling to establish a pre-operational data baseline for Unit 2, and (2) monitoring of impingement at Unit 1 and FitzPatrick in order to estimate the impact of Unit 2's operation.

Our prime concern is that no construction on the once through cooling system should start until (1) the collection and analysis of the biological data is completed, and (2) the issues related to thermal impact are resolved. In contacts between EPA and AEC staff members, we have been informed that the current schedule calls for cooling system construction for Unit 2 to begin in April of 1975 with a planned completion date of November 1976, assuming the AEC awards the construction permit. We also understand that the FitzPatrick unit is scheduled to start operation sometime during the spring of 1974. If this occurs, we would have approximately one year to physically monitor the effects of the FitzPatrick discharge alone and in combination with that of Nine Mile Unit 1. This information on thermal and biological effects should provide a firm basis for making a decision on the acceptability of a once through cooling system which combines the Unit 1 and 2 discharges as proposed.

If the construction and operation schedules remain as cited, I see no problem in the approval of the construction permit for Unit 2 by the AEC. However, should the schedules change to appreciably alter or eliminate the one year period in which the effects of the discharges will be physically monitored, this Office should be notified immediately so that an appropriate course of action can be decided upon between our two Agencies.

Sincerely yours,



Gerald M. Hansler, P.E.
Regional Administrator

Regulatory

File Cy.

