

## Indian Point's Effects on the Hudson River

### **LET'S PUT ENTERGY'S PROPAGANDA ASIDE AND LOOK AT THE FACTS!**



#### INDIAN POINT HARMS THE HUDSON RIVER ECOSYSTEM

- IP's Cooling Water Intake system uses up to 2.5 billion gallons of Hudson River water a day, and kills over a billion fish, eggs and fish larvae annually.
  - New York City's 8 million residents only use 1.1 billion gallons of water a day.
- The government of NY states that this is a **VIOLATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE LAW – AND THAT IT MUST STOP.** Hence the denial of the IP 401 State permit.
- Scientist and government reports show that many Hudson fish

species are in decline, and many fisheries are now closed, including the historic American Shad fishery.

- Radioactive water leaks from Indian Point have contaminated the groundwater under the plant, and are leaching toxic waste into the Hudson River.

#### CLOSED-CYCLE COOLING IS SUPERIOR TO WEDGEWIRE SCREENS

- Using closed-cycle cooling would reduce the fish kills by 93-98%, nearly eliminating this historic threat - This is undisputed by Entergy.
- All new power plants must be built with closed cycle cooling, and nearly half the nuclear plants in the country have used it since the 1970s when they were built – this is proven, reliable technology.
- The Nuclear Regulatory Commission and EPA determined that Indian Point must retrofit to closed-cycle cooling in the 1970s, because of the impacts to fish.
- Entergy admits wedgewire screens are not nearly as effective as closed-cycle cooling in minimizing the impact to Hudson River fisheries. - **THERE IS NO TECHNOLOGY THAT EQUALS CLOSED-CYCLE COOLING FOR REDUCING IMPACTS TO AQUATIC LIFE.**
- Entergy has no concrete plan showing how wedgewire would work at IP
  - The DEC and NRC are doubtful that the very small “screen slots” needed to really protect fish would allow enough volume of water into the plant to keep it operating safely. Unbelievably, Entergy is arguing that DEC approve the wedgewire screens before tests and studies are show that they would work at all, much less reduce impacts by 93-98%. It's like they're saying: “Trust us now, and we'll figure it out later!”



## **ENTERGY CAN AFFORD TO BUILD CLOSED-CYCLE COOLING AT INDIAN POINT**

- Entergy is projected to make **\$17 Billion in profits** over the next 20 years.
- Entergy claims a closed –cycle system would cost about \$1 billion in direct capital costs. Riverkeeper estimates a more accurate amount is about one-half that. Either way, it's easily affordable -- not even counting the billions in profits that the owners of IP have been earning over the past 30 + years – at the expense of your River!



## **ENTERGY DISTORTS THE IMPACTS OF CLOSED-CYCLE COOLING ON THE HUDSON VALLEY AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

- The closed-cycle cooling system would not have to be 17 stories high as Entergy claims, emitting enormous clouds of water vapor.
  - Other closed-cycle systems are available and could be used at Indian Point, such as low profile cooling cells that have much less visual impact and can drastically reduce the “plumes” emitted by older, “Simpsons” style towers.
- ENTERGY has not proven that the plumes from cooling towers at Indian Point would increase asthma rates, or affect public health in any other way – this is simply fear mongering.

## **ENTERGY HAS REAPED ENORMOUS PROFITS FROM DELAYING THE UPGRADE OF IP TO CLOSED-CYCLE COOLING**

- ENTERGY has known since 2003 that closed-cycle cooling, or something equally effective was required by New York State – for purely financial gain, the corporation decided it was cheaper to pay lawyers than to comply with the law and protect the environment.
- Wedgewire screen technology has been around for years, yet Entergy waited seven years to propose using it at Indian Point – now Entergy claims wedgewire is the answer because it can be installed more quickly than cooling towers. This is corporate double-speak at its worst.

## **Timeline of Indian Point and the Fishkill Battle**

- 1973, 1976: Units 2 and 3 were initially licensed (respectively).
- 1976: NRC amended both licenses to require CCC.
- 1977: The owners of IP fought EPA's requirements limiting their cooling water intake system damage.
- 1980 – 1990: The Hudson River Settlement Agreement covering several power plants, stipulated the parties would not press for CCC while studies and data were collected.
- 2000 – 2001: Entergy purchased IP, fully aware of this history
- 2003: NYS Department of Environmental Conservation issues a Draft Permit to IP that requires CCC or its equivalent to reduce fishkills.
- 2010: Litigation on that Draft Permit continues; DEC denies the 401 WQC.

*For more information, or to become a member, please contact us at:  
Riverkeeper, 20 Secor Road, Ossining, NY 10562, (800) 21-RIVER, (914) 478-4501  
[info@riverkeeper.org](mailto:info@riverkeeper.org), [www.riverkeeper.org](http://www.riverkeeper.org)*