

LAW OFFICES OF  
LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE  
1821 JEFFERSON PLACE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036


November 18, 1972

ARVIN E. UPTON  
EUGENE B. THOMAS, JR.  
LEONARD M. TROSTEN  
HARRY H. VOIGT  
WASHINGTON PARTNERS

ONE CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA  
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10005

WASHINGTON TELEPHONE  
202 FEDERAL 8-0111

CABLE ADDRESS  
LALALU, WASHINGTON D. C.



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

Re: Consolidated Edison Company  
of New York, Inc.  
Indian Point Unit No. 2  
AEC Docket No. 50-247

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with the schedule previously agreed upon by the parties, Applicant hereby submits the following information concerning witnesses and proposed cross-examination.

Applicant's sponsoring witnesses for the documents previously submitted to the Board and the parties are Dr. Lauer, Dr. Lawler, Dr. McFadden, Mr. Newman, Dr. Raney and Mr. Woodbury. Depending upon the nature of the cross-examination which other parties may propose to conduct, Applicant may make other witnesses available.

The subjects for Applicant's proposed cross-examination of the Staff and the intervenors are set forth in the attachment. The expected duration for such cross-examination is, of course, difficult to estimate. Our best approximation is three days for the Staff and five days for HRFA-EDF.

We have been attempting for some time to reach agreement with the intervenors on the order for the hearings to proceed, without success. Applicant proposes that after evidence

has been received from all parties, including oral testimony, cross-examination of the Staff by the Applicant and the intervenors shall follow.

In view of the many schedules that must be accommodated, Applicant submits it is essential that the sequence in which the December hearings shall go forward be established at the hearing conference on November 22, 1972.

Very truly yours,

LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE  
Attorneys for Applicant

By Leonard M. Trosten  
Leonard M. Trosten  
Partner

Attachment

cc w/att:

Mr. R. B. Briggs  
Dr. John C. Geyer  
Myron Karman, Esq.  
Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.  
Angus Macbeth, Esq.  
J. Bruce MacDonald, Esq.  
Honorable Louis J. Lefkowitz  
Secretary, USAEC  
Atomic Safety and Licensing  
Board Panel

November 18, 1972

SUBJECTS FOR PROPOSED CROSS-EXAMINATION IN  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEARINGS ON  
INDIAN POINT UNIT 2 OPERATIONS\*

Staff

1. Qualifications of Staff members responsible for sponsoring Final Environmental Statement.
2. Entrainment effects on fishes and other aquatic biota.
  - a. Effects of entrainment on eggs, larvae and juveniles.
  - b. Effects of entrainment on phytoplankton and zooplankton abundance and composition.
  - c. Staff's entrainment model for striped bass.
    - i. Hydraulic and biological assumptions underlying the model.
    - ii. Distribution of eggs, larvae and juveniles.
    - iii. Migration of eggs, larvae and juveniles.
    - iv. Contribution of Hudson River striped bass to the Mid-Atlantic fishery.
3. Impingement of fishes.
  - a. Underlying assumptions.
  - b. Factors affecting impingement.
  - c. Basis for Staff's estimate of future impingement.
  - d. Effect of impingement on white perch, striped bass and other fish populations.

\*Where appropriate, cross-examination will relate to Indian Point Unit 1 as well.

4. Compensatory response of fish populations.
5. Effects of heated discharges from the Plants on phytoplankton and zooplankton.
6. Exposure of aquatic biota to residual chlorine discharged from the Plants.
7. Dissipation of heated discharges from the Plants.
8. Effects of operation of the Plants on dissolved oxygen concentrations in the thermal plume.
9. Closed-cycle cooling alternatives to the present once-through cooling system of Indian Point 2.
  - a. Possible environmental effects of alternatives.
  - b. Time necessary to study, design and install an alternative system.
  - c. Time necessary to study effects of once-through cooling system.
  - d. Cost for installation and operation of an alternative.
  - e. Basis for Staff comparison of benefits versus costs of alternatives.

HRFA-EDF

I. Witness Mr. John Clark

- A. Qualifications to sponsor testimony.
- B. Entrainment model.
  - 1. Hydraulic and biological assumptions underlying the model.
  - 2. Basis for estimates of Hudson River striped bass population, including use of data from the Hudson River Fisheries Investigations 1965-1968.
  - 3. Basis for estimates of removals of striped bass eggs, larvae and juveniles by the Plants.
- C. Effect of entrainment on eggs, larvae and juvenile fish.
- D. Impingement.
  - 1. Underlying assumptions.
  - 2. Factors affecting impingement.
  - 3. Basis for estimate of future impingement.
  - 4. Effect of winter conditions.
  - 5. Mortality caused by impingement.
  - 6. Effect of impingement on striped bass, white perch and other fish populations in the Hudson River.
- E. Contribution of the Hudson River to the Atlantic Coast striped bass fishery.
- F. Compensatory response of fish populations.
- G. Monetary value of the striped bass fishery.
- H. Direct and indirect effects of thermal discharges from the Plants on the fishery.

- I. Direct and indirect effects of chemical discharges from the Plants on the fishery.
- J. Effects of reduced oxygen concentrations resulting from Plant operations.
- K. Direct and indirect effects of Plant operations on phytoplankton and zooplankton.

II. Witness Dr. Eric Aynsley

- 1. Qualifications to sponsor testimony.
- 2. Closed-cycle cooling alternatives to the present once-through system of Indian Point 2.
  - a. Possible environmental effects of alternatives.
  - b. Time necessary to study, design and install an alternative system.
  - c. Cost for installation and operation of an alternative system.