DISTRIBUTION
DOCKET FILE 50-513
AEB R/F
ISpickler
LGHulman
Plant File

#51

MAR 16 1982

DOCKET NO.: 50-513

MEMORANDUM FOR: Elinor Adensam, Chief, LB #4, DL

FROM: L. G. Hulman, Chief, Accident Evaluation Branch, DSI

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW OF WPPSS-1 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

J. Levine of the Meteorology Section has reviewed the WPPSS-1 & 4 Environmental Report in accordance with your February 10, 1982 request. In the accident evaluations in Sections 6.1.3.2 and 7, the applicant utilized inappropriate meteorological models and diffusion parameters. Notwithstanding these deficiencies, sufficient information has been supplied to begin the meteorology review.

The enclosed comments represent the result of this review.

Original signed by:
L. G. Hulman
L. G. Hulman, Chief
Accident Evaluation Branch
Division of Systems Integration

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: RMattson
RJHouston
RTedesco
DEisenhut
WRegan
MBallard
AHorson
JLevine
PEasley

XA Copy Has Been Sent to PDR

8204090039

XA

*See previous concurrences

OFFICE	DSI:AEB*	DSI:AEB*	DSI:AEB				
SURNAME	JLevine:ml	ISpickler	LGHulman				
DATE	3/12/82	3/15/82	3/16/82				

METEOROLOGY ACCEPTANCE REVIEW OF WPPSS-1 & 4 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

The meteorology information provided in the environmental report has considered the impact of the environment on the plant and the possible impact of the plant on the environment. The meteorology information provided is responsive to guidance given in NUREG-0555 (2/79) and is acceptable. However, in section 6.1.3.2, the short term diffusion estimates followed Regulatory Guide 1.4 which is inappropriate, having been replaced by Regulatory Guide 1.145. In section 7.1.2, methods called for in a June 13, 1980 Federal Register notice, i.e., probabilistic risk assessment of a plant accident were not used. Instead, Regulatory Guide 1.145 was used instead of a CRAC type analysis, with standard Pasquill-Gifford dispersion values, σ_y σ_z.

Field tests at the Hanford site have shown modifications to the σ's are needed to account for poorer dispersion conditions in this desert region.

Thus the accident evaluations should use a probabilistic method in Chapter 7 and Regulatory Guide 1.145 for Chapter 6. In both cases, modified σ's should be used.