

Although intervenor cites a portion of the staff's safety evaluation for the Indian Point Unit 2 facility as establishing a relationship between the staff's review of the Indian Point facility and the prior review and experience with the Ginna facility, nothing in the cited article from the Science Magazine (assuming for purposes of the motions that the contents thereof accurately reflect the facts) even suggests that the problem identified at the Ginna facility is of relevance to the safe operation of the Indian Point Unit 2 facility at up to 20% of full power for the purposes of testing as authorized by the Initial Decision dated July 14, 1972.

Neither does the cited article suggest that the problem identified at Ginna affects the safe operation of the Indian Point Unit No. 2 facility at power levels up to 50% for purposes of the proposed testing of the facility nor does such article affect the adequacy of the record submitted by the Licensing Board to the Commission with respect to applicant's motion for authority to operate the Indian Point Unit 2 facility at power levels up to 50% for purposes of the proposed testing of the facility.

Contrary to the implication intervenor attempts to derive from the Science Magazine article, there is no safety problem associated with fuel anomalies of the type identified at the Ginna facility with respect to operation of the Indian Point Unit No. 2 facility at power levels up to 50% of full power for purposes of the proposed testing of the facility.

For the foregoing reasons, intervenor's exceptions and requests should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas F. Engelhardt

Thomas F. Engelhardt
Chief Hearing Counsel

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland,
this 17th day of August, 1972.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD

In the Matter of)

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF)
NEW YORK, INC.)

(Indian Point Station, Unit No. 2))

Docket No. 50-247

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "AEC Regulatory Staff Response to Citizens' Committee for the Protection of the Environment Exceptions to Initial Decision Issued on July 15, 1972," dated August 17, 1972, in the captioned matter, have been served on the following by deposit in the United States mail, first class or air mail, this 17th day of August, 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
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

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

J. Bruce MacDonald, Esq.
New York State Atomic Energy
Council
112 State Street
Albany, New York 12207

Angus Macbeth, Esq.
Natural Resources Defense
Council, Inc.
36 West 44th Street
New York, New York 10036

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
Berlin, Roisman and Kessler
1712 N Street, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20036

Honorable William J. Burke
Mayor of the Village of
Buchanan
Buchanan, New York 10511

Paul S. Shemin, Esq.
New York State Attorney
General's Office
80 Centre Street
New York, New York 10013

Leonard M. Trosten, Esq.
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae
1821 Jefferson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Mr. Frank W. Karas
Chief, Public Proceedings Branch
Office of the Secretary of the
Commission
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545

Thomas F. Engelhardt
Thomas F. Engelhardt
Chief Hearing Counsel