

NOV 15 1974

Docket No. 50-346

The Toledo Edison Company
Attn: Mr. Lowell E. Roe
Vice President
Facilities Development
300 Edison Plaza
Toledo, Ohio 43652

DISTRIBUTION:
AEC PDR
Local PDR
Docket File
LWR 2-3 File
V.A. Moore
F. Schroeder
A. Klecker
M. Karman
RO (3)
I. Peltier
EGoulbourne
TR BCs
LWR 1 & 2 BCs

Gentlemen:

As a result of our continuing review of the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and your responses to our first-round requests for Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, we find that we need additional information and have developed a position regarding Site Analysis (Meteorology). The requests and position are enclosed. Your response to the enclosure is needed by February 28, 1975 in order that we can maintain our review schedule.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
A. Schwencer

A. Schwencer, Chief
Light Water Reactors Branch 2-3
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosure

Requests for Additional Information

POOR ORIGINAL

OFFICE →	7886/LWR 2-3	C-LWR 2-3					
SURNAME →	IPeltier	ASchwencer					<i>App. H.</i>
DATE →	11/14/74	11/15/74					

8001150 836 A

Site Analysis

(Meteorology)

Request No.

- 2.3.2 It has come to our attention that the joint frequency distributions of wind speed and direction by atmospheric stability (defined by delta-T) for the period 12/1/69 - 11/30/70 as presented in the application are not correct. Provide corrected joint frequency distributions. Also discuss the data reduction procedure of the strip chart data for the period 12/1/69 - 11/30/70 used by TRC and MUS, including the averaging technique and the 30-minute period selected (i.e. first 30 minutes of the hour, 15 minutes on each side of the hour, etc.).
- 2.3.4 It appears that after the initial calibrations of the 300 ft. tower in October 1968, no calibration was made until 1971. If this is fact, discuss the impact of this lack of calibration of the data collected from 12/1/69 - 11/30/70, with special emphasis on the measurement of delta-T.
- 2.3.4 Describe in detail the proposed control room monitoring display of appropriate meteorological parameters. Also describe the data collection systems, primary and secondary, used for the 340-ft. and 35-ft. towers. Discuss the data reduction techniques being utilized for these systems.
- 2.3.5 Provide revised accident and annual average relative concentrations values based on the corrected 12/1/69 - 11/30/70 data. Also provide a commitment to verify these values using one full year of data from the new meteorological program.
- 3.3.2 The criteria for the Design Basis Tornado for this plant were established by USAEC Reactor Technology Memorandum No. 1, "Tornado Considerations," dated April 10, 1968. These criteria are: 360 mph maximum wind speed (300 mph rotational plus 60 mph translational); 3 psi pressure drop in 3 seconds followed by immediate recovery; and a tornado radius of 275 feet. Clarify the design basis tornado (presented on p. 3-12) assumed for this plant. If the design basis tornado assumed for this plant does not conform to the Regulatory Tornado Model: identify the differences

Site Analysis (Meteorology)

Request No.

(cont'd) 3.3.2 and perform an analysis of the inherent design capabilities with regard to the tornado parameters and compare these capabilities with the Regulatory criteria.

9.2.8 State the basis for the meteorological design criteria presented on p. 9-45, including length of record examined and percent of time the design criteria can be expected to be equalled or exceeded.

Position No.

2.3.1 It is our position that the relative concentration (X/Q) values based on data collected from 12/1/69 - 11/30/70 be verified by calculations using one full year of onsite data from the new meteorological program that meets the recommendations of Regulatory Guide 1.23. The submittal of this additional year should include a discussion of the representativeness of the onsite data with respect to expected long term conditions at the site. (Provide a schedule for the submittal of these additional data.)