Roger S. Boyd, Asst Dir, Reactor Projects, DRL

1968 MAR 4

1454 :04

THRU

Charles G. Long, Chief RPB-3, DRL .

Original Signed Ev Brian K. Grimes, Reactor Project Branch No. 3 Charles G. Long Division of Reactor Licensing

MEETING WITH COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA OFFICIALS ON AIRPORT PROXIMITY TO THREE MILE ISLAND STATION - DOCKET 50-289

On February 27, 1968, Dr. Mann, C. Long, and B. Grimes met with Pennsylvania to discuss the state's position on Airport Proximity to the proposed Three Mile Island Station. We talked with Thomas M. Gerusky, Coordinator for Atomic Energy Affairs; Margret A. Reilly, Health Physicist; and Gary Sayres of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission.

We inquired as to the state's interest and authority. The only permit which must be obtained from the state is for the release of radioactive effluents to the river, and Mr. Gerusky said that he could see no problem in this regard. There is no state regulation which the height of the plant facilities would violate since the plant is not immediately adjacent to the airport.

Miss Reilly expressed an interest in making sure that the vital functions of the plant would not be disturbed by a plane crash at the site. We provided a copy of Amendment 8 which treats this subject and indicated that we were seeking further information from the applicant.

On behalf of the Aeronautics Commission, Mr. Sayres indicated opposition to the plant because of the potential fog problem caused by the cooling towers and possible turbulence caused by the warm air. He said that this opposition would be expressed by replying to the FAA's circulation of the Form 117 filed by the applicant. He was not aware that the form had been filed (Mr. Sayres was substituting for the man who was working on the case). With respect to the fog problem, he said that they had been in contact with the Morgantown, West Virginia airport which had cooling towers nearby (about the same distance away but in the direct flight path). He said that the Morgantown airport was shut down twice a month because of fog and that this was attributed to the cooling towers. When asked what the state's case would be before a possible FAA hearing board, he stated that the Pennsylvania opposition was strictly on the basis of the Morgantown experience and that no quantitative studies had been performed by the state to determine the extent of the fog problem. He thought that the FAA could prohibit construction of the cooling towers (we have conflicting information on this), but that the FAA would probably

OFFICE . SURNAME . DATE . 7910170 Form AEC-318 (Rev. 9-53) U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1969-0-214-609

compromise and raise the minimum visibility requirements at Olmsted. This would negate the reasons for the existence of the new airport which were (1) to avoid the low minimums at Harrisburg-York and (2) to allow use of Olmsted as a backup for coastal jet airports.

- 2 -

Mr. Gerusky has asked the FAA for present and future flight pattern information at Olmsted. Mr. Sayres noted that flights from Washington to Olmsted pass directly over the Three Mile Island site. When asked, Mr. Sayres said that he thought 747's would land at Olmsted in the future. Mr. Gerusky stated that the state planned to intervene in the AEC public hearing but that no decision to oppose the plant had been made.

cc: M. M. Mann P. A. Morris RP Branch Chiefs T. Engelhardt

Distribution: Supple. DRL Reading RPB-3 Reading B. K. Grimes

1454 305

| OF | FICE | 323-3/034 | RPB-3/DRL |
|------|------|-------------|-----------|
| SURN | | BKGrimes:pt | CGLong |
| | DATE | 3-1-68 | 368 |