

LEGAL  
DEPARTMENT

Harold P. Graves  
Vice President and  
General Counsel

J. B. Falaher  
General Attorney

Robert J. Byers  
H. E. Clark  
C. E. Merritt  
C. K. Petersen  
Stuart H. Redner  
William E. Wisner  
Senior Attorneys

Judd L. Bacon  
Allen B. Bass  
Charles D. Dawson  
R. F. Godbout  
Besondy E. Hagen  
Paula O. Hosick  
Wayne A. Kirkby  
Albert D. McCallum  
W. R. Mills  
John K. Restricker  
David R. Rood  
John M. Smith  
A. T. Udrys  
Attorneys



Consumers  
Power  
Company

General Offices: 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201 • Area Code 517 788-0550

September 8, 1972

DOCKET NOS. 50-329 AND 50-330

Arthur W. Murphy, Esq., Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
Columbia University School of Law  
Box 38, 435 West 116th Street  
New York, New York 10027

Dr. Clark Goodman  
Professor of Physics  
University of Houston  
3801 Cullen Boulevard  
Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. David B. Hall  
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory  
P. O. Box 1663  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

Gentlemen:

Attached hereto is the corrected page which was refer-  
enced in our letter of September 8, 1972 and omitted from that  
filing through oversight.

Respectfully yours,

*John K. Restricker*  
John K. Restricker

JKR/pb



3699-3700). Even the Mapleton Intervenors conceded that the NOAA-Safety Guide No. 4 models were good in the absence of on-site data (Tr. 3684). The Board finds that the use of Safety Guide No. 4, without the application of special restrictive conditions, is sufficiently conservative when applied to the Midland Plant site, in view of the explicit conservatisms in the Safety Guide No. 4 method, the well ventilated atmospheric characteristics of the site as implied by the analysis of the Tri-City Airport data, the favorable experience with this type of analysis at other sites and the absence of any unusual site-sensitive topographical or meteorological problems which would impede diffusion.

67. The Board also notes that the acceptability of the proposed meteorological program of the Applicant (PSAR Applicant's Ex. 1-C, p. 1.00-1) was generally confirmed by the Mapleton Intervenors' witnesses, Mr. Watson (Tr. 3471) and Dr. Epstein (Tr. 3646), with minor reservations regarding whether the tower used for meteorological measurements would be operated with the cooling pond in place, the proper height of the tower, whether multiple towers were desirable and whether a wind tunnel model should be built. With regard to one of these reservations, the NOAA witness concluded that a wind tunnel model of the Plant and cooling pond as proposed by Dr. Epstein would not produce useful results (Tr. 3723). Since the conclusion of the hearing, the AEC has promulgated Safety Guide No. 23, Onsite Meteorology Programs. This guide describes the requirements of an acceptable onsite meteorological program. Such a program is considerably more extensive than that proposed by Applicant in the PSAR. The Board concludes that the Staff should require Applicant to conduct a meteorological program of the scope described