Distribution:
Document Control 50-508
NRC PDR
L PDR
NSIC
PRC System

Docket No.: 50-508

OCT 13 1982

LB#3 File
TNovak
GKnighton
DWheeler
JLee
DSwanson, OELD
EJordan, IE
JTaylor, IE

Mr. R. L. Ferguson
Managing Director
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box 968
3000 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Ferguson:

Subject: Request for Additional Information

Enclosed herewith is a request for additional information from the Hydrologic and Geotechnical Engineering Branch (HGEB) review of the WNP-3 Environmental Report. Your responses to these questions should be received by the NRC staff not later than November 19, 1982.

If additional information or clarification of this request is required, your representatives should contact the WNP-3 Project Manager, Mr. L. Wheeler, 301/492-7792.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Janis D. Kerrigan, Acting Chief
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/encl.:
See next page

OFFICE	DL:LB#3	DL:LB#3					
SURNAME	DWheeler:ph	GKnighton					
DATE	10/ 12 /82	10/ 13 /82					

Mr. R. L. Ferguson
Managing Director
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box 968
3000 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington 99352

cc: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq.
DeBevoise & Liberman
1200 Seventeenth St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Richard Q. Quigley, Esq.
Washington Public Power Supply System
3000 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington 99352

Nicholas D. Lewis, Chairman
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
820 East Fifth Avenue
Olympia, Washington 98505

Mr. Kenneth W. Cook
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box 1223
Elma, Washington 98541

Resident Inspector/WPPSS 3/5
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 545
Elma, Washington 98541

Regional Administrator - Region V
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1450 Maria Lane
Suite 210
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Mr. Thomas W. Bishop
Washington Public Power Supply (WNP-3/5)
P. O. Box 1156
Olympia, Washington 98507

240.08 (ER) (4.0) On a suitable scale map provide delineations of the one percent chance floodplains for watercourses altered or affected by construction and operation of the plant or appurtenant structures. Identify and describe the location of all facilities within the one percent chance floodplains. Include a floodplain delineation for conditions prior to initiation of plant construction and one for conditions expected when the plant is in operation.

240.09 (ER) (4.0) Provide details of your methods of analyses for item 240.08. Include your assumptions of and bases for pertinent parameters such as length and slope of drainage basins, times of concentration, infiltration rates, rainfall amounts and distribution, Manning's "n" values, and any other assumptions or parameters used to determine the floodplains.

In some circumstances floodplain delineation by others may be acceptable. Specifically, if studies by FEMA or the Corps of Engineers are available for the site area, the details of analyses requested above need not be supplied; provide instead the reports from which you obtained the floodplain information.

240.10 (ER) (4.0) Discuss the hydrologic effects of all items identified in 240.08 above. Discuss the potential for altered flood flows and levels, both upstream and downstream. Include the potential effect of debris accumulating on the plant structures. Additionally, discuss the effects of debris generated from the site on downstream facilities.

240.11 (ER) (4.0) Provide the details of your analysis used in response to 240.10 above. The level of detail is similar to that identified in item 240.09 above.

240.12 (ER) (4.0) Describe the effect on river flow of the bank protection constructed in the vicinity of the Ranney Well collectors.

240.13 (ER) (7.1.9.2) Calculate the radiological consequences of a liquid pathway release from a postulated core melt accident. The analysis should assume, unless otherwise justified, that there has been a penetration of the reactor basemat by the molten core mass, and that a substantial portion of radioactively contaminated sump water was released to the ground. Doses should be compared to those calculated in the Liquid Pathway Generic Study (NUREG-0440, 1978). Provide a summary of your analysis procedures and the values of parameters used (such as permeabilities, gradients, populations effected, water use). It is suggested that meetings with the staff of the Hydrologic Engineering Section be arranged so that we may share with you the body of information necessary to perform this analysis.