

ENVIRON, FILE (NEPA)

Docket No. 50-286

MAY 9 1973

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File (Environ)
 EP-1 Reading
 EP-1 File
 GWKnighton, L:EP-1
 MJOestmann, L:EP
 DVassallo, L:PWR
 HSpecter, L:PWR
 NBrown, L:EP-1
 RRush, ORNL
 EStruxness, ORNL

TClerk, ORNL
 VBenaroya L:ESTB
 WEister, L:ESTB
 HDenton, L:SS
 RTedesco, L:CS
 STreby, OGC
 MKarman, OGC

**Daniel R. Muller, Assistant Director for Environmental Projects, L
 THRU: G. W. Knighton, Chief, Environmental Projects Branch No. 1, L**

**TRIP REPORT TO ORNL TO DISCUSS PLANS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF THE PDES FOR
 INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 3.**

On May 4, 1973, I visited ORNL to discuss the progress of work being done for the preparation of the PDES on Indian Point Unit NO. 3. A very rough draft with several sections incomplete has been assembled. The completed draft should be ready for review by the ORNL Review Board by May 14 and 15. AEC staff will review the next draft on May 22 and 23. Issuance of the PDES is scheduled for May 31, 1973.

Details of my discussion with individual team members are described in attachment I.

Original signed by
 M. J. Oestmann

**M. J. Oestmann, Environ. Projects Manager
 Environmental Projects Branch #1
 Directorate of Licensing**

Enclosure as Stated

8111120776 730509
 ADOCK 05000286

OFFICE ▶	L:EP-1	L:EP-1				
SURNAME ▶	MJOestmann:mh	GWKnighton				
DATE ▶	5/8/73	5/ /73				

ATTACHMENT I

DETAILS OF DISCUSSION WITH INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 3 TEAM MEMBERS AT ORNL ON THE PDES - May 4, 1973

1. General

As stated above, the schedule calls for issuance of the IP-3 PDES on May 31, 1973. R. Rush, Team Leader, feels that it will be possible to meet this date. The rough draft I received still has several sections or parts of sections missing such as Introduction, plant construction impacts, parts of plant operation impacts, summary of adverse impacts, and benefit-cost analysis as well as summary and conclusions. Cross referencing material from Unit 2 FES has been done.

I asked Rush what kind of conclusions will be reached regarding operation of once-through cooling versus closed-cycle cooling. Although no balancing between benefits and environmental costs has yet been made, there is a possibility of recommending operation only with closed-cycle cooling. I expressed my concern that any conclusion reached would have to be well supported and based on sound grounds as presented in the text to justify any conclusions reached.

All supplemental information as of April 30, 1973, has been received from the applicant.

2. Radwaste System and Radiological Impact

Most of my time was spent discussing the radwaste system and plans for modifications with T. Clark, who is responsible for preparation of the radiological impact. In view of my discussions with W. Eister, ESTB, on May 2 and 3, a new source term with a modified write up for the radwaste description for the PDES has been determined. The major concern dealt with the present and future system in various combinations of all 3 Units on the one site. A new draft should be available within the next several days. Meanwhile Clark has received information on the liquid and gaseous source terms to complete his calculations for the radiological impact of man and biota. I also showed him details of the radiological monitoring program in the FSAR. He had not looked at the FSAR. Details of the source term will be presented in the new writeup from ESTB in the next few days.

In calculating the radiological doses, we agreed that we should use the 2,058,000 gpm total amount of cooling water used for all 3 Units for dilution of the liquid radwaste discharges. The chemical discharges have been calculated under very conservative conditions of using only a total capacity of 100,000 gpm from operation of the service water system for all 3 Units. In addition, all gaseous discharges are considered to be ground releases.

Clark is to provide me information on thyroid doses via the grass-cow-milk pathway to justify requiring Con Ed to have the plant modifications installed prior to Unit 3 startup. I will need this information before we send a letter to Con Ed describing the AEC position on its radwaste system.

3. Thermal Discharges

Roy Robertson talked with me about calculations of thermal discharges and the calculation of excess isotherms. He used certain information obtained from Con Ed during the site visit. However, the numbers changed as presented in the Supplement 8 from 7050×10^6 Btu/hr to 7350×10^6 Btu/hr for the maximum heat load. The results for calculating the temperature increase with all 3 Units in operation will change from 15.0°F to about 15.3°F . In order to recalculate the data to take into account this 0.3°F change, it would require about one more week of computer calculations. I felt that upon discussion of the situation with Robertson, the time required at this particular time was not warranted. A footnote to explain the difference would be sufficient for the DES. We agreed that this arrangement would be satisfactory since only a 3% change in results would occur.

4. Biological Impact

W. Van Winkle and I had a conference call with B. Norton of Con Ed to clarify some data on concentrations of biota in the Hudson River. We also discussed the possibility of a meeting with Con Ed the last week in June. He felt that there are many areas in the entrainment model development that need clarification. I told him the problems involved with a meeting with Con Ed during the Unit 2 hearing. A meeting at the end of June prior to issuance of the DES might be profitable provided an agreed upon agenda and the proper attendees meet our approval.