

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Eber R. Price, Assistant Director
Division of Licensing & Regulation

DATE: April 22, 1963

FROM : *W.G. Belter*
Walter G. Belter, Chief
Environmental & Sanitary Engineering Br., RD

SUBJECT: U.S. WEATHER BUREAU COMMENTS ON HAZARDS SUMMARY REPORT

RD:DNS:WGB

Reference is made to your letter of April 11, 1963 to the U.S. Weather Bureau requesting comments on the following:

PG & E Proposed Reactor - Bodega Bay,
California
Amendment No. 2 dated April 5, 1963
to license application.

The comments of the Weather Bureau's Environmental Meteorological Research Project are attached.

Attachments
Comments (orig. & 1 cy.)



2308

Comments on

PG & E Proposed Reactor - Bodega Bay, California
Amendment No. 2 dated April 5, 1963 to license application

Prepared by

Environmental Meteorological Research Project
Office of Meteorological Research
U. S. Weather Bureau

April 16, 1963

It appears in Amendment No. 2 that meteorology enters into the questions and responses only in numbers 24, 25, 26 and 27.

The response to Question 24 indicates that reconcentration effects in the environs will be considered in determining release rates. Presumably, this would result in iodine release rates below levels where direct inhalation is controlling. The relation to meteorology is to emphasize the average longer term dispersion patterns and to indicate the desirability of analyzing the local tower data by wind direction and dispersion "classes" over time intervals commensurate with the monitoring program.

In Question 25 it is presumed the "permissible annual average discharge rate" will be based on calculations that include consideration of joint wind direction and stability frequencies. It would be informative to determine for what period of time emissions in excess of this value up to but not including 10 times the annual rate could occur under restrictive dilution conditions without exceeding the 0.5 rem/year limit (see page VI-4, pp. 3 of Preliminary Hazards Report).

In Question 26, since no atmospheric dilution is assumed, the analysis would seem quite conservative. Even if the wind speed were reduced to 1 mph thus increasing the inhalation period by a factor of 10 the omission of cloud rise and diffusion should still result in conservative estimates.

Question 27 involves only changes in source strength possibilities. Since a constant wind and stability situation is assumed for computational purposes the meteorology is conservative.