

Docket File
(ENVIRON)

ENVIRON, FILE (NEPA)

Docket No. 50-286

JUN 22 1973

Mr. Richard Rush
Team Leader Indian Point
Environmental Projects
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P. O. Box X
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Dear Dick:

Thank you for your letter of June 15, 1973, with copies of an "Incomplete Preliminary Draft" for the IP-3 PDES. I am in the process of reviewing this draft and will forward my comments within the next several days. Please find enclosed my comments on the earlier draft that George Knighton and I reviewed on May 22 and 23 at ORNL. These were informally transmitted to you, at that time, as well as during my visit on May 31 and June 1 to ORNL and were sent in a package to you in the mail on June 9. However, it appears that this package was lost in the mails. Comments were also written in the draft copy I left with you on May 31.

I am also forwarding to you copies of other articles in the lost package by C. Boston from ORNL. Also enclosed is another revised radwaste write-up dated June 6, 1973 from the Effluent Treatment Systems Branch. I hope that the source term has remained the same as the last one obtained during the month of May from the ETSB so no recalculation of the radiological dose by T. Clark has to be done. Please let me know immediately if the numbers have changed. I hope this will be the "final" writeup and source term. I have also compiled a table for comparison of data in the Safety Evaluation Report and the DES sections on this subject to be sure the information is consistent. This should also pertain to the dose calculations. As you can see, there is a large discrepancy in values presented in the SER and DES and also between the ETSB and Con Ed values. Discrepancies also exist for dose values between those obtained from RAB and those T. Clark calculated.

In regards to the thermal discharge calculations, I recall that Siman-Tov took the conservative approach and used the 4,000 cfs fresh water flow value in his calculations for multiplant effects. This of course represents the "once in 10 years" drought conditions. I believe that additional calculations should be made assuming normal fresh water flow conditions during the summer.

OFFICE ▶	811112017B 730622 PDR ADOCK 05000286 D PDR				
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

Please find enclosed copies of the letter received June 13, 1973 sent from H. Woodbury and our reply dated June 14, 1973 in reference to the two-day seminar on entrainment models. We will have to postpone such a meeting until you have completed all the work for the PDES. Con Ed is anxious to have a meeting. H. Woodbury called on June 20 to insist the meeting be held as soon as possible but was informed about your commitment to finish the PDES for IP-3.

The revised schedule proposed by E. Struxness in his letter of June 14, 1973 is under review here. We will advise you shortly regarding the approval of the dates you proposed. Meanwhile, every effort should be made to complete your work as quickly as possible. Any guidance or effort to write up sections I can offer you, please let me know. I hope our earlier comments will assist you in expediting the issuance of the PDES.

Again, thank you. As soon as I can, I may be down to visit ORNL to see how things are coming along.

Sincerely,

MS

M. J. Oestmann, Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch No. 1
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosures:
As stated

Distribution:
Docket File (Environ)
RP Reading
EP-1 Reading
G. Knighton
R. Cleveland
D. Muller
M. J. Oestmann
W. Eister, ETSB

OFFICE ▶	L:EP-1				
SURNAME ▶	<i>MJO</i> MJOestmann:mw				
DATE ▶	6/21/73				