

FEB 13 1973

Docket No. 50-247
50-286

ENVIRON, FILE (NEPA)

Daniel R. Muller, Assistant Director for Environmental Projects, L
THRU: George W. Knighton, Chief, EPB-1, L

TRIP REPORT TO ORNL TO DISCUSS INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 2 HEARINGS AND
TO SCOPE OUT THE PREPARATION OF THE PDES FOR UNIT NO. 3

A trip was made by the Project Manager to ORNL on January 31 - February 1, 1973 for the purpose to (1) discuss the status of commitments for the hearing on Indian Point Unit No. 2 and (2) to meet with the team members and discuss the preparation of the PDES for Unit No. 3. Discussions were held with individual IP-2 team members regarding commitments for the hearing and to the applicant and informing them of the plans for the hearing session beginning March 5, 1973. Schedules and plans for the site visit were discussed with R. Rush, Team Leader, and W. Stockdale with the team members. Details of the discussions are enclosed.

15/

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

Enclosure:
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:

- Docket File (2) ✓
- EP-1 Reading
- EP-1 File
- RP Reading
- DMuller, L:EP
- GWKnighton, L:EP
- MKarman, OGC
- ELyle, OGC
- KKniel, L:PWR
- WYee, Team Leader, ORNL
- RRush, Team Leader, ORNL
- EStruxness, Env. Director, ORNL
- NBrown, L:EP-1

811110304 720213
ADOCK 05000247

CRESS	OFFICE ▶	EP-1	EP-1			
T-2140	R-05					
	SURNAME ▶	MJOestmann:cls	GWKnighton			
2/12/73	DATE ▶	2/ /73	2/ /73			

ENVIRON. FILE (NEPA)

Docket Nos. 50-247
and 50-286

DETAILS OF THE TRIP TO ORNL ON JANUARY 31 - FEBRUARY 1, 1973 FOR MEETINGS
ON INDIAN POINT UNITS NOS. 2 AND 3.

I. Commitments for the Indian Point Unit No. 2 Hearings

- A. William Yee and I discussed the status and commitments we had with the ASLB and the applicant. They are as follows:
 - (1) Preparation of information on Roseton and Bowline fossil plants regarding environmental impact on the aquatic biota and the thermal discharges.
 - (2) Preparation of staff statement regarding cost-benefit balance of limited power operation of Unit No. 2.
 - (3) Preparation of response to the applicant's request on biological impact from the meeting held at Bethesda Headquarters on January 18, 1973 with J. Lawler, R. Norris and others who are consultants for the applicant.
 - (4) Preparation of redirect testimony
 - a. P. Goodyear's review of cross-examination
 - b. M. Siman-Tov's review on thermal discharges
 - c. M. Carter's review on cost-benefit
 - (5) Preparation of corrections to the transcripts
- B. M. Carter and I discussed plans to prepare testimony regarding the CBA of restricted power. He will deliver a document on February 12 on the subject. Input to the document will include information on this same subject obtained from the applicant on February 5.
- C. A conference call was held with Ed Cohen, R. Norris, representing the applicant and P. Goodyear, W. Yee and M. J. Oestmann regarding different items the applicant requested on the staff's entrainment model based on the meeting held with J. Lawler and R. Norris in Bethesda on January 18, 1973. P. Goodyear provided me a number of computer printouts in reference to this request. These

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

computer runs complied with the request and were delivered to the applicant on February 2, 1973. All the information requested by the applicant has since been sent to the applicant.

- D. M. Siman-Tov was in the process of preparing a revised version of the thermal discharge study of all the power plants on the Hudson from his earlier study. This document was delivered to me on February 9 and has been sent to the ASLB. In addition, P. Goodyear prepared the study of the biological impact of the other fossil plants on the river. Both Goodyear's and Siman-Tov's documents were sent on February 9, 1973 to the ASLB and the parties in compliance with the request by the ASLB on December 15, 1972.
- E. The individual team members, Yee, Goodyear, Siman-Tov, and Carter, are presently reviewing the redirect and rebuttal testimony sent from the applicant on February 5, and are preparing redirect-rebuttal testimony to be sent to the ASLB and the parties on February 19, 1973. Corrections to the transcript are also being prepared.
- F. Technical Specifications which were due on January 26, 1973, have not been received from the applicant. The applicant plans to submit these on February 20. I have alerted the team members to review them carefully upon arrival before we have a discussion with the applicant. A possible time for discussion could be during the site visit for Unit No. 3 on February 21-22, 1973.

II. Scope of Effort for Preparation of The PDES for Indian Point Unit No. 3.

A. Scheduling

R. Rush, W. Stockdale and I discussed scheduling for the PDES. We agreed upon the following activities and dates.

Site Visit	2/20-2/23/73
Review of first draft of PDES by ORNL Review Board, AEC personnel	4/23-4/24/73
Issuance of PDES	5/4/73

Stockdale will prepare the ORNL schedule based on these dates.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

B. Team Members

Many team members are new to the Indian Point case and are not as well acquainted with the IP-2 problems. The older ones will, however, provide backup support for IP-3 PDES but are involved with the IP-2 hearings. A list of team members and their technical areas is enclosed.

C. Plans for the PDES

A meeting of the team members and group leaders was held on February 1 to outline the program to prepare the PDES. I discussed the general considerations of the AEC rules and regulations including filing and docketing procedures of information used for the PDES. It was agreed upon that the team members would cross reference as much as possible the material in the IP-2 FES. To do so, each member would have to swear that although he did not write the actual words, he would agree to the substance and accuracy of the material used.

The areas which would not require much effort include Chapters I, II, IV, VIII, IX so that a summary would be used for these chapters. However, the team members were told to focus their attention on those areas involving a change from what is in the IP-2 FES. These include the thermal discharge section in Chapter III, the biological impact section, the need for power, alternatives and cost-benefit analyses. Much more emphasis would be placed on looking at alternatives, primarily cooling towers and their impact from fogging, salt deposition, noise, chemical discharges, etc. In addition, a CBA of operation at different power levels would be considered for different periods of the year which is presently being taken into account in the IP-2 hearings.

The source term and radwaste description will be prepared by the Effluent Treatment Systems Branch and will be incorporated into the PDES. Team members inquired about consideration of an alternate radwaste system for the PDES. T. Clark will prepare the radiological impact section and it will be sent up to the Radiological Assessment Branch for review before the PDES will be printed. The accident analysis section prepared at Headquarters will also be sent to ORNL for incorporation into the PDES.

In regards to alternative methods of cooling (once-through and

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

closed-cycle), the team members mentioned several combinations as follows:

	Case I	IIa	IIb	III
IP-1	OT	OT	OT	CC
IP-2	OT}1/78	CC}1/78	CC}1/78	CC
IP-3	OT	OT	OT*	CC

* Partial flow-partial power.

The team will consider these different possibilities when assessing the impact of them.

In terms of consideration of the other fossil fuel plants on the Hudson, I recommended that that section will be included as an appendix to the PDES.

I recommended that the team members use any information used for the IP-2 FES including transcripts as reference material. A separate bibliography list will be included in the PDES.

In terms of the summary and conclusions for the PDES, I recommended that whatever the conclusions would be in terms of considering full power, partial power, or with or without a closed-cycle system to be operational within a specified time period, the text of the document must support the conclusions reached.

D. Plans for Site Visit

Tentative arrangements were made for the site visit starting February 20, 1973. Arrangements have been made to visit the plant on February 21-22, and discuss the environmental questions already sent to the applicant, and to meet with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation on February 20, 1973. A preliminary list of questions from R. Rush were given to the Project Manager.

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 3

TEAM MEMBERS FOR DES AND YES

Team Leader: R. M. Rush

Site and Resources: W. Vaughn, R. Bryan

Reactor Cooling Systems: R. C. Robertson
W. C. Tunnell
E. Picklesimer

Liquid Effluents: H. E. Zittel

Radiological Impact: T. G. Clark
C. Easterly

Biological and Environmental Impact: W. Van Winkle
B. E. Dinger
C. P. Goodyear
(consultant)

Benefit/Cost Analysis Alternatives: C. M. Carter

Need for Power: C. M. Carter
H. Guberman
(consultant)

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
BATE ▶						

ENVIRON, FILE (NEPA)

FEB 13 1973

Docket No. 50-247
50-286

Daniel R. Muller, Assistant Director for Environmental Projects, L
THRU: George W. Knighton, Chief, EPB-1, L

TRIP REPORT TO ORNL TO DISCUSS INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 2 HEARINGS AND
TO SCOPE OUT THE PREPARATION OF THE PDES FOR UNIT NO. 3

A trip was made by the Project Manager to ORNL on January 31 - February 1, 1973 for the purpose to (1) discuss the status of commitments for the hearing on Indian Point Unit No. 2 and (2) to meet with the team members and discuss the preparation of the PDES for Unit No. 3. Discussions were held with individual IP-2 team members regarding commitments for the hearing and to the applicant and informing them of the plans for the hearing session beginning March 5, 1973. Schedules and plans for the site visit were discussed with R. Rush, Team Leader, and W. Stockdale with the team members. Details of the discussions are enclosed.

15/

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

Enclosure:
As stated

- DISTRIBUTION:
- Docket File (2) ✓
 - EP-1 Reading
 - EP-1 File
 - RP Reading
 - DMuller, L:EP
 - GWKnighton, L:EP
 - MKarman, OGC
 - ELyle, OGC
 - KKniel, L:PWR
 - WYee, Team Leader, ORNL
 - RRush, Team Leader, ORNL
 - EStruxness, Env. Director, ORNL
 - NBrown, L:EP-1

CRESS OFFICE ▶ T-2140 R-05	EP-1	EP-1				
SURNAME ▶	MJOestman:cls	GWKnighton				
DATE ▶	2/ 17 /73	2/ 17 /73				

Docket Nos. 50-247
and 50-286

DETAILS OF THE TRIP TO ORNL ON JANUARY 31 - FEBRUARY 1, 1973 FOR MEETINGS ON INDIAN POINT UNITS NOS. 2 AND 3.

I. Commitments for the Indian Point Unit No. 2 Hearings

A. William Yee and I discussed the status and commitments we had with the ASLB and the applicant. They are as follows:

- (1) Preparation of information on Roseton and Bowline fossil plants regarding environmental impact on the aquatic biota and the thermal discharges.
- (2) Preparation of staff statement regarding cost-benefit balance of limited power operation of Unit No. 2.
- (3) Preparation of response to the applicant's request on biological impact from the meeting held at Bethesda Headquarters on January 18, 1973 with J. Lawler, R. Norris and others who are consultants for the applicant.
- (4) Preparation of redirect testimony
 - a. P. Goodyear's review of cross-examination
 - b. M. Siman-Tov's review on thermal discharges
 - c. M. Carter's review on cost-benefit
- (5) Preparation of corrections to the transcripts

B. M. Carter and I discussed plans to prepare testimony regarding the CBA of restricted power. He will deliver a document on February 12 on the subject. Input to the document will include information on this same subject obtained from the applicant on February 5.

C. A conference call was held with Ed Cohen, R. Norris, representing the applicant and P. Goodyear, W. Yee and M. J. Oestmann regarding different items the applicant requested on the staff's entrainment model based on the meeting held with J. Lawler and R. Norris in Bethesda on January 18, 1973. P. Goodyear provided me a number of computer printouts in reference to this request. These

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

computer runs complied with the request and were delivered to the applicant on February 2, 1973. All the information requested by the applicant has since been sent to the applicant.

- D. M. Siman-Tov was in the process of preparing a revised version of the thermal discharge study of all the power plants on the Hudson from his earlier study. This document was delivered to me on February 9 and has been sent to the ASLB. In addition, P. Goodyear prepared the study of the biological impact of the other fossil plants on the river. Both Goodyear's and Siman-Tov's documents were sent on February 9, 1973 to the ASLB and the parties in compliance with the request by the ASLB on December 15, 1972.
- E. The individual team members, Yee, Goodyear, Siman-Tov, and Carter, are presently reviewing the redirect and rebuttal testimony sent from the applicant on February 5, and are preparing redirect-rebuttal testimony to be sent to the ASLB and the parties on February 19, 1973. Corrections to the transcript are also being prepared.
- F. Technical Specifications which were due on January 26, 1973, have not been received from the applicant. The applicant plans to submit these on February 20. I have alerted the team members to review them carefully upon arrival before we have a discussion with the applicant. A possible time for discussion could be during the site visit for Unit No. 3 on February 21-22, 1973.

II. Scope of Effort for Preparation of The PDES for Indian Point Unit No. 3.

A. Scheduling

R. Rush, W. Stockdale and I discussed scheduling for the PDES. We agreed upon the following activities and dates.

Site Visit	2/20-2/23/73
Review of first draft of PDES by ORNL Review Board, AEC personnel	4/23-4/24/73
Issuance of PDES	5/4/73

Stockdale will prepare the ORNL schedule based on these dates.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

B. Team Members

Many team members are new to the Indian Point case and are not as well acquainted with the IP-2 problems. The older ones will, however, provide backup support for IP-3 PDES but are involved with the IP-2 hearings. A list of team members and their technical areas is enclosed.

C. Plans for the PDES

A meeting of the team members and group leaders was held on February 1 to outline the program to prepare the PDES. I discussed the general considerations of the AEC rules and regulations including filing and docketing procedures of information used for the PDES. It was agreed upon that the team members would cross reference as much as possible the material in the IP-2 FES. To do so, each member would have to swear that although he did not write the actual words, he would agree to the substance and accuracy of the material used.

The areas which would not require much effort include Chapters I, II, IV, VIII, IX so that a summary would be used for these chapters. However, the team members were told to focus their attention on those areas involving a change from what is in the IP-2 FES. These include the thermal discharge section in Chapter III, the biological impact section, the need for power, alternatives and cost-benefit analyses. Much more emphasis would be placed on looking at alternatives, primarily cooling towers and their impact from fogging, salt deposition, noise, chemical discharges, etc. In addition, a CBA of operation at different power levels would be considered for different periods of the year which is presently being taken into account in the IP-2 hearings.

The source term and radwaste description will be prepared by the Effluent Treatment Systems Branch and will be incorporated into the PDES. Team members inquired about consideration of an alternate radwaste system for the PDES. T. Clark will prepare the radiological impact section and it will be sent up to the Radiological Assessment Branch for review before the PDES will be printed. The accident analysis section prepared at Headquarters will also be sent to ORNL for incorporation into the PDES.

In regards to alternative methods of cooling (once-through and

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

closed-cycle), the team members mentioned several combinations as follows:

	Case I	IIa	IIb	III
IP-1	OT	OT	OT	CC
IP-2	OT 1/78	CC 1/78	CC 1/78	CC
IP-3	OT	OT	OT*	CC

* Partial flow-partial power.

The team will consider these different possibilities when assessing the impact of them.

In terms of consideration of the other fossil fuel plants on the Hudson, I recommended that that section will be included as an appendix to the PDES.

I recommended that the team members use any information used for the IP-2 FES including transcripts as reference material. A separate bibliography list will be included in the PDES.

In terms of the summary and conclusions for the PDES, I recommended that whatever the conclusions would be in terms of considering full power, partial power, or with or without a closed-cycle system to be operational within a specified time period, the text of the document must support the conclusions reached.

D. Plans for Site Visit

Tentative arrangements were made for the site visit starting February 20, 1973. Arrangements have been made to visit the plant on February 21-22, and discuss the environmental questions already sent to the applicant, and to meet with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation on February 20, 1973. A preliminary list of questions from R. Rush were given to the Project Manager.

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

INDIAN POINT UNIT NO. 3

TEAM MEMBERS FOR DES AND FES

Team Leader: R. M. Rush

Site and Resources: W. Vaughn, R. Bryan

Reactor Cooling Systems: R. C. Robertson
W. C. Tunnell
E. Picklesimer

Liquid Effluents: H. E. Zittel

Radiological Impact: T. G. Clark
C. Easterly

Biological and Environmental Impact: W. Van Winkle
B. E. Dinger
C. P. Goodyear
(consultant)

Benefit/Cost Analysis Alternatives: C. M. Carter

Need for Power: C. M. Carter
H. Guberman
(consultant)

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						