

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

(Date)

TO:

Dr

REPLY FOR CHAIRMAN'S SIGNATURE

REPLY FOR SIGNATURE BY GM _____ DR _____

(Please send two copies of reply to Office of Chairman)

Dr

FOR APPROPRIATE HANDLING

FOR INFORMATION: GM ☒ DR _____ Commissioners ☒

REMARKS:

Julius H. Rubin
For the Chairman

Rec'd Off. Dir. of Reg.

Date 5/24/71

Time 11:30

MAR 22 1971

Docket No. 50-263

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie
United States Senate

Dear Senator Muskie:

This is in response to your January 21, 1971, referral of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert pertaining to present AEC radiation protection standards and operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Station by Northern States Power Company.

With respect to the Time magazine article, we understand that Dr. Gofman's estimates of increases in the incidence of diseases from radiation exposure are based on the assumption that the total U. S. population receives an average population exposure of 170 millirems per year. As a practical matter, under the regulations of the AEC as they are applied in limiting levels of radioactivity in effluents from nuclear power plants, the average dose to the population could not exceed a very small fraction of 170 millirems per year.

Experience to date from some 13 operating nuclear power plants shows that radioactivity in water and air effluents from these plants have generally been kept at less than a few percent of the limits specified in AEC regulations. Increases in radiation exposures to the public living in the near vicinity of typical plants have generally been about 5 millirems per year or less above natural background radiation exposures of about 100 millirems per year. Average exposures to the population living within a radius of 50 miles of these plants have been and are expected to continue to be about 1/10,000 or less of the FRC guide of 170 millirems per year.

The fact that the Federal district court has ruled that Minnesota may not enforce its own standards for releases of radioactivity from the Monticello facility and that Federal standards are exclusively applicable does not mean that the facility will discharge at the upper limit of AEC standards. The actual levels of radioactivity that will be released in effluents from Monticello will be much lower. The Monticello plant and its associated waste treatment systems are designed to keep radioactivity releases in effluents and resultant exposures to the public in the low ranges experienced with other operating nuclear power plants.

OFFICE ►

SURNAME ►

DATE ►

One of the major actions taken by the Commission this last year was the publication on December 3, 1970, of amendments to its regulations that will help to further assure that radioactivity in effluent releases is continued to be kept as low as practicable. The amendments improve the framework in 10 CFR Part 20 for assuring that reasonable efforts are made by all Commission licensees to keep exposure to radiation and releases of radioactivity to effluents as low as practicable. They also specify in 10 CFR Part 50 design and operating requirements to minimize quantities of radioactivity in gaseous and liquid effluents from nuclear power reactors.

In regard to radiation standards, the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements recently completed a 10-year study on radiation protection standards. The results of this study are contained in its Report No. 39 issued in January of this year. As stated in the press release by the NCRP upon the release of the report "the results of the Council's 10-year study confirm the values presently utilized for governing long-term cumulative occupational exposure and exposure to the general public."

In response to Mrs. Gilbert's concern about the reports of high incidence of cancer and leukemia in southern Washington and northern Oregon stemming from operations at Hanford, I am enclosing an article, "Oregon Malignancy Pattern and Radioisotope Storage," written by two employees of the National Cancer Institute. This report concludes with the statement that "no evidence was found that persons living downstream from the Hanford Preserve or along the Pacific Coast of Oregon have had an excess risk of death from cancer in general or from leukemia in particular."

Sincerely,

(signed) Harold L. Price

Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Public Health Reports Article
2. Ltr fm Mrs. Gilbert dtd 1/5/71

Distribution:

HLPrice Gertter (DR-3034)
PAMorris Congressional (2)
HKShapar
PDR (50-263)
JHCook

REVISED AND RETYPED IN OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGULATION.
SEE ATTACHED YELLOW FOR PREVIOUS CONCURRENCES.

2/3/18

OFFICE ▶	DR	OGC	DR	OCR		
	Easterling:		<i>2/3/18</i>	<i>OS</i>		
SURNAME ▶	Cook:Henderson	Knotts&Schur	HLPrice			
DATE ▶	ps:vhw 3/17/71	3/10/71	3/20/71	3/24/71		

Docket No. 50-263

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie
United States Senate

Dear Senator Muskie:

This is in response to your January 21, 1971, referral of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert pertaining to present AEC radiation protection standards and operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Station by Northern States Power Company.

With respect to the Time magazine article, we understand that Dr. Gofman's estimates of increases in the incidence of diseases from radiation exposure are based on the assumption that the total U. S. population receives an average population exposure of 170 millirems per year. As a practical matter, under the regulations of the AEC as they are applied in limiting levels of radioactivity in effluents from nuclear power plants, the average dose to the population could not exceed a very small fraction of 170 millirems per year.

Experience to date from some 13 operating nuclear power plants shows that radioactivity in water and air effluents from these plants have generally been kept at less than a few percent of the limits specified in AEC regulations. Increases in radiation exposures to the public living in the near vicinity of typical plants have generally been about 5 millirems per year or less above natural background radiation exposures of about 100 millirems per year. Average exposures to the population living within a radius of 50 miles of these plants have been and are expected to continue to be about 1/10,000 or less of the FRC guide of 170 millirems per year.

The outcome of the Minnesota lawsuit referred to in Mrs. Gilbert's letter has nothing to do with the actual levels of radioactivity that will be released in effluents from the Monticello nuclear power plant. The Monticello plant and associated waste treatment systems are designed to keep radioactivity releases in effluents and resultant exposures to the public in the low ranges experienced with other operating nuclear power plants.

*Received
3/18/71*

OFFICE ▶

SURNAME ▶

DATE ▶

Docket No. 50-263

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie
United States Senate

Dear Senator Muskie:

This is in response to your January 21, 1971, referral of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert pertaining to present AEC radiation protection standards and operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Station by Northern States Power Company.

With respect to the Time magazine article, we understand that Dr. Gofman's estimates of increases in the incidence of diseases from radiation exposure are based on the assumption that the total U.S. population receives an average population exposure of 170 millirems per year. As a practical matter, under the regulations of the AEC as they are applied in limiting levels of radioactivity in effluents from nuclear power plants, the average dose to the population could not exceed a very small fraction of 170 millirems per year.

Based on experience from the operation of existing reactors, conservative estimates indicate that increases in radiation exposures to the public living in the near vicinity of typical plants have been less than 5 millirems per year from all pathways of exposure. This experience indicates that radioactivity in water and air effluents from such facilities have generally been kept at less than a few percent of the limits specified in AEC regulations.

Average exposures to the total population living within a radius of 50 miles of these plants have been and are expected to continue to be less than one-ten thousandths of the Federal Radiation Council guide of 170 millirems per year. This actual level of one-one hundredths of a millirem per year should be viewed in the perspective that persons living in brick or stone houses incur higher exposures than persons living in wooden houses, the differences generally ranging up to more than 50 millirems per year. People living in some western cities incur exposures from natural background that are about 70 millirems per year more than exposures incurred by persons living in Washington, D.C. In fact, the exposure to persons living in the near vicinity of nuclear power plants is a small fraction of that which they receive from natural background radiation.

OFFICE ►

SURNAME ►

DATE ►

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie

- 2 -

In regard to radiation standards, the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurement recently completed a 10-year study on radiation protection standards. The results of this study are contained in its Report No. 39 issued in January of this year. As stated in the press release by the NCRP upon the release of the report "the results of the Council's 10-year study confirm the values presently utilized for governing long-term cumulative occupational exposure and exposure to the general public."

In response to Mrs. Gilbert's concern about the reports of high incidence of cancer and leukemia in southern Washington and northern Oregon stemming from operations at Hanford, I am enclosing an article, "Oregon Malignancy Pattern and Radioisotope Storage," written by two employees of the National Cancer Institute. This report concludes with the statement that "no evidence was found that persons living downstream from the Hanford Preserve or along the Pacific Coast of Oregon have had an excess risk of death from cancer in general or from leukemia in particular."

Sincerely,

Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Public Health Reports Article
2. Ltr fm Mrs. Gilbert dtd 1/5/71

Distribution:

H.L. Price
PAMorris
HKShapar
PDR (50-263)
JHCook
Gertter (DR-3034)
Congressional (2)

REVISED AND RETYPED IN OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGULATION.
SEE ATTACHED YELLOW FOR PREVIOUS CONCURRENCES.

OFFICE ▶	DR	OGC	DR	OCR		
SURNAME ▶	Easterling: Cook;Henderson ps:vhw	Knotts&Schur	HLPrice			
DATE ▶	3/16/71	3/10/71	3/ /71	3/ /Ø1		

Docket No. 50-263

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie
United States Senate

Dear Senator Muskie:

This is in response to your January 21, 1971, referral of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert pertaining to present AEC radiation protection standards and operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Station by Northern States Power Company.

An operating license was issued to Northern States Power Company on January 19, 1971, pursuant to the Initial Decision of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board dated January 15, 1971. Plant operation at power levels in excess of five megawatts (thermal) was subject to notification from AEC of verification of feedwater pump performance. That notification was given on February 18, 1971, and operation at full power (1670 megawatts thermal) is now authorized in accordance with the license and technical specifications.

The principal bases for the Commission's regulation and special license requirements governing the release of radioactivity in effluents from AEC-licensed activities have been the radiation protection guides developed by the Federal Radiation Council (FRC) and approved by the President for the guidance of all Federal agencies. These guides take into account the recommendations of the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurement (NCRP) and the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP).

The NCRP recently completed a 10-year study on radiation protection standards. The results of this study are contained in its Report No. 39 issued in January of this year. As stated in the press release by the NCRP upon the release of the report "the results of the Council's 10-year study confirm the values presently utilized for governing long-term cumulative occupational exposure and exposure of the general public."

OFFICE ►

SURNAME ►

DATE ►

Under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3, which became effective on December 2, 1970, the functions of the FRC and that part of AEC's authority, as administered by its Division of Radiological and Environmental Protection, to develop and set generally applicable environmental radiation standards for the protection of the general environment were transferred to the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

In response to Mrs. Gilbert's concern about reports of high incidence of cancer and leukemia in southern Washington and northern Oregon stemming from operations at Hanford, I am enclosing an article, "Oregon Malignancy Pattern and Radioisotope Storage," written by two employees of the National Cancer Institute. This report concludes with the statement that "no evidence was found that persons living downstream from the Hanford Preserve or along the Pacific Coast of Oregon have had an excess risk of death from cancer in general or from leukemia in particular."

Sincerely,

Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Public Health Reports Article
2. Ltr fm Mrs. Gilbert dtd 1/5/71

Distribution:

H. L. Price
P. A. Morris
H. K. Shapar
Public Document Room (50-263)
J. H. Cook
G. E. Ertter (DR-3034)
Congressional (2)

REVISED AND RETYPED IN OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF REGULATION
SEE ATTACHED YELLOW FOR PREVIOUS CONCURRENCES

OFFICE ▶	DR	OGC	DIR:DR	OCR		
SURNAME ▶	Easterling: Cook:Henderson	Knotts&Schur	HLPRICE			
DATE ▶	PS 3/15/71	3/10/71	3/ /71	3/ /71		

Docket No. 50-263

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie
United States Senate

Dear Senator Muskie:

I am pleased to provide the following information in response to your January 21, 1971, referral of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert pertaining to present AEC radiation protection standards and opposing operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Station by Northern States Power Company.

As indicated in the enclosed press announcement, an operating license was issued to Northern States Power Company on January 19, 1971, pursuant to the initial decision of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board dated January 15, 1971. Plant operation at power levels in excess of five megawatts (thermal) was subject to notification from AEC of verification of feedwater pump performance. That notification was given on February 18, 1971, and operation at full power (1670 megawatts thermal) is now authorized in accordance with the license and technical specifications.

The principal bases for the Commission's regulations and special license requirements governing the release of radioactivity in effluents from AEC-licensed activities are the radiation protection guides developed by the Federal Radiation Council (FRC) and approved by the President for the guidance of all Federal agencies. The FRC radiation protection guides take into account the recommendations of the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) and the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP). Under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3, which became effective on December 2, 1970, the functions of the FRC and that part of AEC's authority, as administered by its Division of Radiological and Environmental Protection, to develop and set generally applicable environmental radiation standards for the protection of the general environment were transferred to the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The AEC retains the responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of EPA standards in carrying out its functions under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Changes in general environmental radiation standards issued by EPA will be appropriately reflected in AEC regulations.

OFFICE ►

SURNAME ►

DATE ►

The NCRP recently completed a ten year study and has issued a report on the validity of the basic radiation protection criteria. I am enclosing a copy of the NCRP's January 26, 1971, press release for Mrs. Gilbert's information.

In addition, I am enclosing a statement by Mr. Lester Rogers, Director of AEC's Division of Radiological and Environmental Protection, before the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, which discusses the sources of radioactivity in effluents from nuclear power plants, the development of radiation protection standards, AEC's regulations for the control of levels of radioactivity from these plants, including measures to keep releases of radioactivity to the environment as low as practicable, and operating experience with such plants to date.

Mrs. Gilbert also expressed concern about reports of high incidence of cancer and leukemia in southern Washington and northern Oregon stemming from operations at Hanford. I believe Mrs. Gilbert will be interested in the enclosed article, "Oregon Malignancy Pattern and Radioisotope Storage," written by two employees of the National Cancer Institute and which concludes with the statement that "No evidence was found that persons living downstream from the Hanford Preserve or along the Pacific coast of Oregon have had an excess risk of death from cancer in general or from leukemia in particular."

If we can be of any further assistance to you or to Mrs. Gilbert, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Press Announcement No. 0-9
2. NCRP Press Release
3. Statement by Mr. Rogers
4. Public Health Reports Article
5. Ltr fm Mrs. Gilbert, 1/5/71

DISTRIBUTION:

HLPrice
PAMorris
HKShapar
PDR (50-263)
JHCook
GEErtter (DR-3034)
BEasterling
OCR (2)

HL

CRESS g1 T13 R1-2	OFFICE ▶	DR	OGC	DR	OCR		
	SURNAME ▶	JCook/g1		HLPrice			
	DATE ▶	3/8/71	3/10/71	3/ /71	3/ /71		

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie
United States Senate

Dear Senator Muskie:

I am pleased to provide the following information in response to your January 21, 1971, referral of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert pertaining to present AEC radiation protection standards and opposing operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Station by Northern States Power Company.

As indicated in the enclosed press announcement, an operating license was issued to Northern States Power Company on January 15, 1972. *notification from AEC January 19, 1971, pursuant to the initial decision of the* *Plant operation was subject to verification of feedwater pump performance which was given in February.* *at lower levels in excess of four megarems (internal)* *price asked and known around dated 1/21/71, and question of just or a new authority - in accordance with NEA license and technical specifications.*

The principal bases for the Commission's regulations and special license requirements governing the release of radioactivity in effluents from AEC-licensed activities are the radiation protection guides developed by the Federal Radiation Council (FRC) and approved by the President for the guidance of all Federal agencies. The FRC radiation protection guides take into account the recommendations of the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) and the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP). Under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3, which became effective on December 2, 1970, the functions of the FRC and that part of AEC's authority, as administered by its Division of Radiological and Environmental Protection, to develop and set generally applicable environmental radiation standards for the protection of the general environment, were transferred to the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The AEC retains the responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of EPA standards in carrying out its functions under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. *any changes in radiation protection standards issued by EPA will be reflected in AEC regulations.* *appropriately*

The NCRP recently completed a ten year study and has issued a report on the validity of the basic radiation protection criteria. I am enclosing a copy of the NCRP's January 26, 1971, press release for Mrs. Gilbert's information.

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

Honorable Edmund S. Muskie

- 2 -

In addition, I am enclosing a statement by Mr. Lester Rogers, Director of AEC's Division of Radiological and Environmental Protection, before the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, which discusses the sources of radioactivity in effluents from nuclear power plants, the development of radiation protection standards, AEC's regulations for the control of levels of radioactivity from these plants, including measures to keep releases of radioactivity to the environment as low as practicable, and operating experience with such plants to date.

Mrs. Gilbert also expressed concern about reports of high incidence of cancer and leukemia in southern Washington and northern Oregon stemming from operations at Hanford. I believe Mrs. Gilbert will be interested in the enclosed article, "Oregon Malignancy Pattern and Radioisotope Storage," written by two employees of the National Cancer Institute and which concludes with the statement that "No evidence was found that persons living downstream from the Hanford Preserve or along the Pacific coast of Oregon have had an excess risk of death from cancer in general or from leukemia in particular."

If we can be of any further assistance to you or to Mrs. Gilbert, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Press Announcement No. 0-9
2. NCRP Press Release
3. Statement by Mr. Rogers
4. Public Health Reports Article
5. Ltr fm Mrs. Gilbert, 1/5/71

DISTRIBUTION:

HLPrice
PAMorris
HKShapar
PDR (50-263)
JHCook
GEErtter (DR-3034)
BEasterling
OCR (2)

CRESS	OFFICE ▶	DR	OCC	DR	OCR	
T193a, R5,4		<i>[Signature]</i>				
dlp	SURNAME ▶	JHCook:dlp		HLPrice		
	DATE ▶	2x8 3/1/71	3/ /71	3/ /71	3/ /71	

Distribution:

H. L. Price
C. L. Henderson
P. A. Morris
H. K. ShaparOCR (2)
C. Miles, PI
OCR (2)
G. Ertter, DR-3034
PDR (50-263)
B. Easterling

Docket No. 50-263

Honorable Edward Muskie
United States Senate

Dear Senator Muskie:

I am pleased to provide the information below in response to your January 21, 1971, referral of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert pertaining to present AEC radiation protection standards and opposing operation of the Monticello Nuclear Power Reactor by Northern States Power Company.

As indicated in the enclosed press announcement, an operating license was issued to the Company on January 15, 1971, subject to certain limitations.

In regard to Mrs. Gilbert's concern about present radiation standards, and specifically the claims by Drs. Gofman and Tamplin, the adequacy of these criteria have been overwhelmingly supported by the general scientific community. A more recent example is the enclosed press announcement by the National Council on Radiation Protection.

It should be noted that the responsibility for developing and setting of generally applicable environmental radiation standards was recently transferred to the New Environmental Protection Administration. The AEC continues to have responsibility for the implementation and enforcement, through its licensing and regulatory authority, of the environmental radiation standards set by EPA.

I hope this information and the enclosed materials will be helpful to your constituent.

Sincerely,

Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation

Enclosure:

1. NCRP Announcement
2. Ltr. from Mrs. Gilbert, 1/5/71

CRESS OFFICE ▶	AO <i>BE</i>	DRL	OGC	ADRA	DR	OCR
T-500-R2:en						
SURNAME ▶	BEasterling				HLPrice	
DATE ▶	2/1/71	2/ /71	2/ /71	2/ /71	2/ /71	2/ /71

FROM

Sen. Edward Muskie (Maine)

CONTROL NUMBER

3034

ACTION COMPLETION DEADLINE

2/1/71

DATE OF DOCUMENT

1/21/71

LOCATION

TO

OCC: O'Neill

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

Ltr

☒ Original☐ Copy☐ Other

Trans by ltr to Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert, Minneapolis, re cancer deaths/AM that will result if AEC standards are allowed to continue and urging legislation to stop the Monticello plant from operating at full capacity within 30 days.

12270

REMARKS

Reply for signature of Dir. of Reg.

Mark envelope: ATTN: A. Jensen

REFERRED TO

DATE

Sullivan t/action

1/23/71

Cys: Morris

Sheper

DNR (58-143)

BE 1/26

Copy sent PDR

Is notification to the JCAR recommended? no

FROM SENATOR E. S. MUSKIE (D-ME)	DATE OF DOCUMENT 1/21/71	DATE RECEIVED 1/21/71	CONTROL NUMBER 12270		
TO CGR: O'NEILL	SUSPENSE DATE 1/22	FILE CODE			
	CLASSIFICATION Series: U Copy _____ of _____	REPLY DATES Acknowledged 1/25 Interim _____ Final _____		SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate Handling <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION: LET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Copy <input type="checkbox"/> Other		PREPARE FOR SIGNATURE OF: <input type="checkbox"/> CHAIRMAN <input type="checkbox"/> DIV./OFFICE DIRECTOR <input type="checkbox"/> GENERAL MANAGER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DIR. OF ADM. <input type="checkbox"/> ASST. GENERAL MANAGER			
TRANS. CT OF LTR FM MRS. DOROTHY E. GILBERT OF MINNEAPOLIS MINN., RE CANCER DEATHS WHICH WILL RESULT IF THE AIR STANDARDS OF NUCLEAR POLLUTION ARE ALLOWED TO CONTINUE UNCHECKED & ASKING FOR LEGISLATION WHICH WILL STOP THE WORTICELLO PLANT FROM OPERATING AT FULL CAPACITY WITHIN 30 DAYS ENCLOSURES		REMARKS:			
CT OF LTR TO SEN. MUSKIE FM MRS. DOROTHY E. GILBERT, MD 1/5/71					
REFERRED TO	DATE			RECEIVED BY	DATE
NRG	1/22				
INFORMATION COPIES SENT TO:		<input type="checkbox"/> CHAIRMAN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DIR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GENERAL MANAGER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CGR H ST. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SGM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ACHRD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PACH <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ACH <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OGG			

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMUNICATIONS CONTROL
 U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

FORM HQ-284
(4-68)

United States Senate

Washington, D. C., _____ 1/21 _____, 1971

Respectfully referred to

Mr. Robert D. O'Neil
Director, Congressional Relations
A.E.C.

Please prepare reply to this
letter and return information
to:

Sen. E.S. Muskie
221 Senate Office Building
Washington D.C.

Attn: A. Jensen

Thank you for your trouble.

U. S. S.

DR-3034

OFFICE OF
SENATOR
EDWARD S. MUSKIE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

JAN 11 10 34 AM

2544 Tenth Av. So.
Minneapolis, Minn. 55404
Jan 5, 1971

Senator Edward Muskie
Senate Office Bldg. Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie:

First of all let me compliment you for taking an interest in the information revealed by the Radiation scientists at the Lawrence Lab. at the Univ. of Calif. Namely- that 32,000 extra cancer deaths will result in the U.S. each year if the A.E.C standards of Nuclear Pollution are allowed to continue unchecked. I am referring to the article in Time Magazine- Jan 4th issue, page 49. I hope that you will look into this grave situation thoroly.

We have a Nuclear power plant- the Monticello Plant, just 40 miles north of the Twin Cities - which has been the center of a controversy for several years- The state hired a consultant, Ernest Tsivoglou of Georgia Tech. to study the situation. He recommended .01/300ths of the amount of nuclear pollution allowed by the A.E.C.. The state of Minn. has now lost its case. Our only hope is the Congress will enact a law that will allow the states to set their own safety standards to protect the citizens.

I plead with you for the sake of over 2 million people in Minneapolis and St. Paul. not to mention people all the way down the Mississippi River who will be affected by this decision- please try to get some legislation which will stop the Monticello Plant from operating at full capacity within 30 days. We already know of the high incidence of cancer and leukemia in southern Washington and northern Oregon from the Hanford Nuclear Plant out there and also the same situation in northern Minn. from the Canadian plant which pollutes the water supply in northern Minn. Until we know more about the results of such pollution the power companies should be made to clean up the water supply before it leaves the plant. It can be done. Please let me hear from you. I am a very concerned citizen.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert

Mrs. Dorothy E. Gilbert