Distribution
Dockt File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
LWR #4 File
RCDeYoung
DBVassallo
FJWilliams
SAVarga
CStahle
MService
RHeineman
DRoss
JKnight
RTedesco
HDenton
VAMoore
RHVollmer
MLErnst
WPGammill
ELD
IE (3)
ACRS (16)
JRBuchanan
TBABeranthy

October 15, 1976

Docket Nos. 50-390
and 50-391

Tennessee Valley Authority
ATTN: Mr. Godwin Williams, Jr.
Manager of Power
830 Power Building
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401

Gentlemen:

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL METEOROLOGY INFORMATION ON WATTS BAR

Enclosed are additional requests for information as a result of our acceptance review of Appendix I information on the Watts Bar plant. This information is needed to complete our evaluation of the meteorology in the vicinity of the plant.

It is requested that this information be submitted within five weeks from the receipt of this letter in order to maintain our schedule.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
S. W. Moon

S. A. Varga, Chief
Light Water Reactors
Branch No. 4
Division of Project Management

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: Herbert S. Sanger, Jr. Esq.
General Counsel
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 Commerce Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

APPL 3

OFFICE	DPM/LWR #4	DPM/LWR #4	D			
SURNAME	CStahle;pv	SAVarga				
DATE	10/14/76	10/15/76				

Form AEC-318 (Rev. 9-53) AECM 0240 ☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974-526-166

OCT 0 5 1976

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
WATTS BAR, UNIT NOS. 1 & 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-390/391

1. Provide evidence that the period of onsite meteorological data collection was representative of long-term atmospheric dispersion conditions at the site. For example, this could be done by comparing the monthly or seasonal joint frequency distributions at a neighboring NWS station during the period of onsite data collection with similar averages for a long-term period (at least 5 years). This would be a comparison of short-term NWS data with long-term data from the same NWS station.

2. A description of the monitoring program at the Watts Bar site is presented, but the starting speed of the wind direction sensor is not included. Provide this information.

3. Describe airflow trajectory regimes of importance in transporting effluents to a distance of 50 miles from the plant, including airflow reversals.

4. Provide information concerning the validity and accuracy of the model and assumptions used in the calculation of relative concentration and deposition estimates for the Watts Bar site.

5. Discuss similarities between Hartsville and Watts Bar (e.g., site area characteristics, review procedures) which justify deletion of rainfall rate distributions and monthly precipitation wind roses in the Watts Bar Appendix I submittal as was done in the case of Hartsville.