

February 8, 1979

50-549



NEC PUBLIC DOCUMENT ROOM

Greene County

SUMMARY OF MEETING - JANUARY 30, 1979

On January 30, 1979 a meeting was held at PASNY's request in Bethesda, Maryland to afford PASNY the opportunity to discuss with top NRC Staff management certain areas of environmental impact which the Staff has identified. A list of those in attendance is attached.

PASNY identified the following areas for discussion: (1) mitigation - taxes, (2) access road alternatives, (3) Lehigh, and (4) aesthetics.

Mitigation:

Tax exempt status of PASNY is not a site-specific problem, it would be a factor at any chosen site. NRC queried whether PASNY has considered making substantial payments for mitigative action, as TVA has in connection with various of its power plants.

PASNY indicated that it will monitor impacts on local communities of the construction of GCNPP and implement appropriate mitigative actions.

Access roads:

PASNY originally focused on providing an upgraded Route 9W. PASNY is now prepared to adopt van-pooling, which it believes can work. TVA has used this method. PASNY maintained that "portal-to-portal" payment to employees under the "park and ride" alternative would not be necessary.

Lehigh:

Cementon was chosen as preferred site because the area was already in industrial use. Proximity of Hudson River was also an important factor. PASNY viewed Lehigh as a marginal operation. PASNY explained that from the outset it was concerned with avoiding blame for causing shutdown of Lehigh, which it believes will likely close down anyway. PASNY explained that it was also concerned with preserving employment in the area surrounding GCNPP. PASNY asserted that under improvements in the production process proposed by Heidelberger, employment would drop from 175 to 100. PASNY views the Cementon site as too valuable for cement production for Lehigh to move.

7902280250

A

PASNY explained that under state law, it could be compelled to assume the taxes on the entire Lehigh property.

Aesthetics:

Olana has 60,000 visitors per year. PASNY stated that the plume from the proposed natural draft cooling tower would generally occupy only a very small area on the horizon.

Additional matters discussed:

NRC inquired as to whether PASNY has ever undertaken any mitigation in connection with its projects. PASNY cited the following instances: (1) landscaping ordered by the state in connection with Niagara Hydro project, (2) PASNY built parks on the St. Lawrence, and (3) PSC has established the policy that an amount equal to 2% of the cost of transmission lines will be paid by utilities for recreational purposes.

NRC queried whether PASNY has considered the possibility of "offsets" to the impact on the view from Olana, as is allowed under the Clean Air Act. This would entail some improvement in the aesthetic impact of industrial facilities in the Cementon area as an "offset" to the construction of GCNPP. PASNY responded that the only offset it could conceive of was removal of the cement company stacks and their plumes.

The option of a mixed wet-dry cooling (circular) tower was discussed. PASNY asserted that the plume from such a tower would be much less severe than from a natural draft tower. However, such a tower would entail \$5-10 million additional annual costs.

PASNY asserted that the costs of moving to an alternative site would be in the range of \$300 - 500 million.

PASNY asserted that it could build a nuclear power plant more cheaply than a private utility. It pointed specifically to its contract (tied to GCNPP) for uranium at \$12/lb.

PASNY emphasized the goal of energy independence for New York City.

PASNY asserted that Cementon is the "obviously superior" site for GCNPP.

Further discussion on cooling tower plumes:

PASNY stated that the plume from a circular mechanical draft tower would rise more than 200 ft above the tower mouth only 20% of the time. PASNY also asserted that a plume from Athens would be more visible at Olana than would the plume from Cementon. At Olana the Athens plume would be seen broadside, whereas the Cementon plume would be seen coming toward the viewer.

At the invitation of the NRC Staff, several other parties in attendance posed questions.

ATTENDANCE SHEET

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Steve Lewis	NRC
Charles M. Pratt	Power Authority
Lewis R. Bennett	Power Authority
George T. Berry	Power Authority
Andrew Barchas	Power Authority
Guy Cunningham	NRC - OELD
Howard K. Shapar	NRC - OELD
H. R. Denton	NRC - NRR
L. V. Gossick	NRC - EDO
David Engel	NYS DEC
Orest Lewinter	NYS DEC
Robert J. Kafin	Counsel for 3 Intervenors
Loretta Simon	Greene County et al.
Algird F. White, Jr.	Degraff, Foy, et al. (Lehigh)
Michael Flynn	NYS PSC
B. J. Youngblood	NRC - CBAB
M. L. Ernst	NRC - AD for Envir. Tech
V. A. Moore	NRC - AD for Envir. Projects
Singh Bajwa	NRC - EP 2
Sid Feld	NRC - CBAB
John Smolinsky	N.Y.S. Dept. of Public Service