

SEP 10 1976

Docket No. 50-410

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation  
ATTN: Mr. Gerald R. Rhode  
Vice President - Engineering  
300 Erie Boulevard West  
Syracuse, New York, 13202


Gentlemen:

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION  
UNIT 2

We have reviewed your July 21, 1976 submittal of additional information relating to the physical model testing of the proposed revetment-ditch system for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station - Unit 2. As a result of that review we have developed requests for additional information. The enclosure to this letter delineates the information which we will require in order to continue our review of the proposed revetment-ditch system.

If you require clarification of the information which we have requested, please contact the NRC staff's assigned Licensing Project Manager immediately.

Sincerely,

  
S. A. Varga, Chief  
Light Water Reactors  
Branch No. 4  
Division of Project Management

Enclosure:  
Request for Additional  
Information

cc: See next page

Distribution

NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
Docket File  
LWR #4 File  
RCDeYoung  
DBVassallo  
FJWilliams  
WKane  
SAVarga  
MService  
RHeineman  
DRoss  
JKnight  
RTedesco  
HDenton  
VAMoore  
RH

RHVoillmer  
MLErnst  
WPGammill  
WMcDonald  
ELD  
IE (3)  
ACRS (16)  
JMiller  
JRBuchanan  
TBAbernathy

OFFICE >	DPM/LWR #4	DPM/LWR #4				
SURNAME >	WKane	SAVarga				
DATE >	09/9/76	09/10/76				

1. The first part of the report is a general description of the project and its objectives. It includes a brief history of the project and a statement of the problem to be solved.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed description of the methodology used in the study. It includes a description of the data sources, the data collection methods, and the data analysis methods.

3. The third part of the report is a description of the results of the study. It includes a description of the data and a discussion of the findings.

4. The fourth part of the report is a conclusion and a list of references.

5. The fifth part of the report is a discussion of the implications of the study. It includes a discussion of the limitations of the study and a discussion of the future research needs.

6. The sixth part of the report is a list of references. It includes a list of the books, articles, and other sources used in the study.

7. The seventh part of the report is a list of appendices. It includes a list of the tables, figures, and other materials that are included in the report.

8. The eighth part of the report is a list of footnotes. It includes a list of the footnotes that are included in the report.

9. The ninth part of the report is a list of acknowledgments. It includes a list of the people and organizations that have helped in the study.

10. The tenth part of the report is a list of the authors. It includes a list of the names of the authors of the report.

11. The eleventh part of the report is a list of the titles of the chapters. It includes a list of the titles of the chapters that are included in the report.

SEP 10 1976

Alvin E. Upton, Esq.  
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae  
1757 N Street, NW  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Richard Goldsmith  
Syracuse University  
College of Law  
E. I. White Hall Campus  
Syracuse, New York 13210

Dr. William E. Seymour  
Staff Coordinator  
New York State Atomic Energy Council  
New York State Department of Commerce  
99 Washington Street  
Albany, New York 12210

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.  
Roisman, Kessler & Cashdan  
1712 N Street, NW  
Washington, D. C. 20036



SEP 10 1976

1. We have reviewed your July 21, 1976 submittal and conclude that additional information is required to progress with our review of your model test proposal. Since the preliminary model tests have indicated little or no overtopping, but rather, wave transmission through the structure, we are concerned that your testing program does not account for potential clogging of the revetment voids with littoral drift, vegetation, and/or debris. We note that significant bluff erosion and subsequent longshore transport of littoral material is common along the southern shoreline of Lake Ontario. We are concerned that significant material could be transported to the site and deposited at the revetment area in such a manner as to inhibit or preclude the flow of water through the revetment. Also, changes in the shoreline at the revetment ends (over the plant lifetime) could accelerate the erosion process. This would make the revetment much less permeable, possibly causing breaking waves to overtop the structure rather than be transmitted through it, as designed. We further note that no provisions have been made in your model testing program to account for the effects of short-term or long-term permeability reduction in the revetment.

Since maintaining the permeability of the revetment is very important in allowing flow (in both directions) through the structure, we will require that you submit the following information and documentation:

- (1) Document by pertinent analyses that there is no potential for deposition of littoral drift or debris in the site area, due to any particular physical characteristics, shoreline configurations, structure designs, etc.
- (2) Document the preventive measures that will be taken to assure that the revetment will not become clogged. If applicable, discuss any features that will be constructed (or monitoring and maintenance measures that will be implemented) to prevent buildup of littoral material and debris.
- (3) If (1) or (2) above cannot be documented, you will be required to account for reduced permeability due to littoral buildup in your model testing. We will require further information regarding the procedures and testing that will be performed to document the adequacy of your revetment design under reduced permeability conditions. This information should be provided in the form of a preliminary test report.
- (4) Alternately, we will require that no credit be given for wave transmission through the clogged structure and that runoff and overtopping tests be performed using an impervious structure.



2. We note that Figure 8 of your July 21, 1976 submittal has not been revised (as discussed in our recent meeting) to reflect the correct water depths on the structure toe, especially at the east end of the revetment. Either correct the figure or revise your model testing to account for the increased water depths as shown on Figure 8.
3. As shown on Figure 7, one month will not be adequate time for the NRC staff to review and approve your model testing report. A minimum of eight weeks will be required for staff review. Revise your schedule accordingly.

