

NOV 6 1972

R. C. DeYoung, Assistant Director for PWR's, L

POSITION STATEMENT ON INDIAN POINT UNIT 3

PLANT NAME: Indian Point Unit 3

LICENSING STAGE: OL

DOCKET NO: 50-286

RESPONSIBLE BRANCH: PWR #1

REQUESTED COMPLETION DATE: 10/20/72

APPLICANTS RESPONSE DATE NECESSARY FOR

NEXT ACTION PLANNED ON PROJECT: ASAP

REVIEW STATUS: Site Analysis Branch - OL Review Continuing

Our position on the Indian Point Unit 3 doses from the loss of coolant accident is unchanged from that discussed with the applicant during the initial meeting with Consolidated Edison (memo of February 24, 1971, from R. S. Lee to R. C. DeYoung) and in our branch memo of December 22, 1971 (from R. P. Grill to A. Schwencer). Our calculations, as shown in Table 1, are based on current spray and filter reduction factors and on X/Q values used by the staff on evaluations of units 1 and 2.

The containment leak rate appears already as low as practical and can not be further reduced. Marginal improvements in the existing spray and filter system will not provide significant additional iodine removal. Although potential public risk from unit 3 is the same as that for Indian Point unit 2, we have concluded that literal compliance with Part 100 limiting doses should be required for Indian Point 3. The most practical potential solution appears to be for the applicant to increase the site boundary in the direction of the Georgia Pacific Corp. Gypsum Plant. This could be accomplished by legal arrangements similar to that used for the Zimmer Nuclear Facility.

Attached is an additional question regarding this matter. We have also requested additional on-site meteorological data to confirm our previous evaluations.

811190787 721106
OF ADDCK 05000286

TABLE I

STAFF DESIGN BASIS ACCIDENTS DOSES
(BASED ON 3216 MWt)

		<u>THYROID</u> (REM)	<u>WHOLE BODY</u> (REM)
<u>LOCA</u>	Site Boundary (330 Meters)	310	16
	LPZ (1100 Meters)	102	8
<u>REFUELING</u>	Site Boundary	52	6
	LPZ	8	1

Harold R. Denton, Assistant Director
for Site Safety
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: w/o enclosure
A. Giambusso
W. McDonald

DISTRIBUTION:

✓ L:Docket File 50-286
L:Rdg.
L:SAB
L:AD/SS

cc: w/enclosure
S. H. Hanauer
J. M. Hendrie
W. P. Gammill
D. Vassallo
H. Specter
C. Ferrell

OFFICE ▶	L:SAB	L:SAB	L:AD/SS		
SURNAME ▶	<i>CMT</i> CFerrell:bas	<i>WPG</i> WPGammill	<i>HR</i> HRDenton		<i>Memo</i>
DATE ▶	11/3/72	11/3/72	11/ /72		

INDIAN POINT 3
QUESTION LIST NO. 2

Our evaluation of the consequences of the LOCA based on previous meteorological evaluations (on-site data is still under staff review) indicates doses in excess of the guidelines of 10 CFR Part 100. This was brought to your attention during our initial meeting on the O.L. Review for Unit No. 3. Describe what means will be taken to reduce these doses to acceptable levels.