

MAR 17 1972

Samuel W. Jensch, Esq., Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dr. John C. Geyer, Chairman
Department of Geography and
Environmental Engineering
The Johns Hopkins University
513 Ames Hall
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Mr. R. B. Briggs
Molten Salt Reactor Program
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P. O. Box Y
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

In the Matter of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.,
Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2
Docket No. 50-247

Gentlemen:

The responses of the AEC regulatory staff to the questions asked by
the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board at the hearing session
on January 11, 1972 are attached herewith.

Sincerely,

Myron Karman
Counsel for AEC Regulatory Staff

cc: Leonard M. Trosten, Esq.
Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
Angus Macbeth, Esq.
J. Bruce MacDonald, Esq.
Paul S. Shemin, Esq.
Honorable William J. Burke
Nathaniel H. Goodrich, Esq.
Algie A. Wells, Esq.
Mr. Stanley T. Robinson, Jr.

bcc: OGC Beth.
OGC Gmtn
Docket File (2)
H Shapar
T Engelhardt
DRL (Karl Kniel)
REG. Central File
M Karman Chrono

8111050219 720317
PDR ADDCK 05000247
G PDR

OFFICE ▶	GC MK	GC RW				hearing
SURNAME ▶	MKarman:rs					
DATE ▶	3/17/72	3/17/72				

(TR-4531)

Mr. Briggs: I think it probably would be satisfactory if the Staff looked at these numbers and indicated in writing how they compare with the numbers that the applicant has estimated; and, if there are differences, important differences at least, why the important differences exist.

The difference between 5 curies and 5 millicuries probably is an important difference.

Answer: A review of the derivation on the Staff's stated 5 curies (Ci) of fission products and activation products in water stated on page 20 indicates that the staff used a decontamination factor (d.f.) of 10^4 for the evaporator system described by the applicant in their FSAR. This d.f. was established after renewing data measured on a similar evaporator at the Ginna Station owned by Rochester Gas and Electric Co. These test results are documents in Amendment No. 17 to the FSAR (Docket No. 50-318, Calvert Cliffs). It is our understanding that the applicant is using a d.f. of 10^5 for the evaporator and has included an additional d.f. of 10^2 for a demineralizer for final processing of the evaporator overhead. This results in a 5 millicurie output compared to the staff 5 curies output.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

(TR-4539)

Mr. Briggs: I had the impression that very little water of the Hudson River was used for drinking until you get up to somewhere in Peconic and I was wondering whether the 10 percent number might be higher, or how it compares.

Answer: For the purpose of establishing a conservative estimate of regional dose to the population in the 50 mill radius of the site, the Staff assigned and assumed up-take of radioactivity by 10% of the people through consumption of Hudson River water. This assumption was made even though it is known that the Hudson River, both at the site and south of the site, is not a source of drinking water. If the City of Poughkeepsie is the nearest large source of drinking water from the Hudson, then its population of 38,360 (1960 census) would suggest a further conservatism when compared to the 170,000 population assumed by the staff.

(TR-4540)

Mr. Briggs: Well, it says -- There is a sentence here in the middle of the first paragraph that says:

"The probability of occurrence of accidents and the spectrum of their consequences to be considered from an environmental effects standpoint have been analyzed using best estimates of probabilities --"

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

Now it seems to me rather important that somewhere one gives some numbers concerning what those "best estimates of probabilities" are.

On page 37, in the second paragraph, I guess, it says here in the second sentence:

"In general, we consider the events in Classes 2 through 5 are improbable --"

There are Classes 2 through 5 in Table 3. Class 2 has to do with a small valve or pipe leak. Class 3 has waste gas decay tank valve leak. Class 5 has normal operation with fuel failures and steam generator leaks.

Is the experience we have with nuclear power plants such as to say that a steam generator leak is improbable? I had the impression that several reactors, water reactors had steam generator leaks.

Answer: In reference to the probabilities of accidents discussed on pp. 36-41 of the Staff's testimony, you are referred to the Federal Register, Volume 36, No. 231, p. 22851, Wednesday, December 1, 1971, in which is published the AEC proposed rule "Consideration of Accidents in Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969," 10 CFR Part 50,

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

Appendix D. This is the position used in preparing the accident evaluation by the Staff on pages 36-41. The referenced proposed rule discusses the probability of the classes of accidents and provides assumptions to be used in calculating their impact.

(TR-4571)

Chairman Jensch: That wasn't my question. Maybe it was not clearly stated. The 16.6, Table B, on page 46, is that a percentage of reserve of peak load, or is it a percentage of net capability?

Answer: The 16.6% for Summer of 1972 Reserve, in Table B, page 46 of the Staff's testimony, represents percent of peak load without Indian Point 2 to full capacity.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						