

LAW OFFICES
LOWENSTEIN AND NEWMAN
1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

202 296-7585

August 20, 1971

ROBERT LOWENSTEIN
JACK R. NEWMAN
JEROME E. SHARFMAN



Arthur W. Murphy, Esq., Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Columbia University School of Law
Box 38, 435 West 116th Street
New York, New York 10027

Dr. Clark Goodman
Professor of Physics
University of Houston
3801 Cullen Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. David B. Hall
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
P.O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS
POOR QUALITY PAGES

In the Matter of Consumers Power Company
Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-329 and 50-330

Gentlemen:

Our letter of August 18, 1971 made reference to the AEC's Interim Guidance on Modification in Applicant's Environmental Reports and indicated that a copy was enclosed.

A review of our file indicates that copies of the Interim Guidance document were, however, inadvertently omitted in the transmittal. Accordingly, enclosed is a copy of the referenced document.

Respectfully,

Lowenstein & Newman
LOWENSTEIN AND NEWMAN
Attorneys for Applicant
Consumers Power Company

JN:sb
Enclosure

8007160922

th

cc: William J. Ginster, Esq.
James A. Kendall, Esq.
Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
Thomas F. Engelhardt, Esq.
Milton R. Wessel, Esq.

James N. O'Connor, Esq.
Myron M. Cherry, Esq.
Algie A. Wells, Esq.
Stanley T. Robinson, Esq.
Irving Like, Esq.



DOCKET NUMBER

PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 50-329,330

August 4, 1971

INTERIM GUIDANCE ON MODIFICATION IN APPLICANT'S ENVIRONMENTAL
REPORTS AND AEC STATEMENTS UNDER NEPA

In its decision of July 23, 1971, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in litigation involving the Calvert Cliffs nuclear power plant directed the Atomic Energy Commission to revise in several respects its rules implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The Commission is presently preparing appropriate regulations to implement the Court's decision. The Commission will be reevaluating the NEPA environmental statements previously issued in connection with its licensing activities and those in preparation in order to prepare supplemental NEPA statements which meet the requirements of the Court's decision.^{1/} In the meantime applicants for construction permits and operating licenses for nuclear facilities should review their environmental reports previously submitted in light of the Court decision and develop supplemental information, where indicated, to conform to the Court decision. In this regard the "Guide to the Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plants" which the AEC issued for interim use and comment in February 1971 should be carefully followed. Specific emphasis should be given to the following in your review.

1. Complete information must be included on thermal and other effects of the facility with respect to water quality as discussed in Sections 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 of the Draft Guide.
2. In those cases where once thru cooling is proposed, alternative methods of heat dissipation (including costs) must be discussed as outlined in Section 2.5, Paragraph 4, of the Draft Guide.
3. The completeness of information on environmental effects of the facility such as land use compatibility (Section 2.3.1 of the Draft Guide), aesthetics (Section 2.3.9 of the Draft Guide), and recreation should be reviewed and all relevant information included.
4. A detailed analysis of the need for power which will be generated in the nuclear unit subject to licensing must be included in each environmental report (Section 2.1 of the Draft Guide). Alternative methods of generating the power as discussed in Section 2.5 of the Draft Guide should be discussed and analyzed.

^{1/} Interim guidance for holders of operating licenses issued since January 1, 1970, will be issued at a later date.

5. In the Court decision, there is a discussion of the cost-benefit balancing which must be carried out in each detailed statement issued by the AEC. To assist the AEC in making this balance, detailed information should be provided on the need for the power produced at the facility subject to licensing, any significant environmental impact incurred in producing the power and the alternatives available (including cost) for reducing or avoiding the environmental impact. The differences in the balance between benefits and environmental impact of the various alternatives identified above should be discussed and analyzed.