

**NUCLEAR UTILITY METEOROLOGICAL DATA USERS GROUP MEETING
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
OCTOBER 20 & 21, 1994**

The third meeting of the Nuclear Utility Meteorological Data Users Group (NUMUG) was held October 20 & 21, 1994 at The Park Hotel in Charlotte, North Carolina. Duke Power Company sponsored the meeting which was attended by 47 people representing 21 utilities, 10 private consulting firms, 3 Department of Energy facilities, a National Weather Service office and an Illinois State Agency.

A reception was held Wednesday evening from 7 pm to 10 pm in the Chambers Board Room of The Park Hotel highlighted by complimentary hors d' oeuvres. Socializing with old acquaintances and making new ones was the main theme of the reception.

Nick Keener of Duke Power Company opened the meeting Thursday morning with welcoming remarks. Nick also served as host moderator throughout. Mr. Tony McConnell of Duke Power Company was the guest speaker. Mr. McConnell's address was "Commercial Nuclear Power in the USA - A Longterm Perspective." He stressed that the challenge facing the nuclear industry today was to continue stringent cost control while focusing on maintaining systems and equipment of an aging fleet of nuclear plants. Additional challenges include license renewal and radiological waste disposal.

A Dinner Social was held Thursday evening at the Charlotte Motor Speedway. Before dinner, attendees were treated to two laps around the Speedway, a real thrill for all of us, including the bus driver! Duke Power Company also had two of their new electric vehicles available for test drives in the Speedway area.

During the course of the two day meeting, 14 papers covering a wide variety of topics were presented. The presentations given are listed below.

- 1) Status Update on ANS/ANSI 2.5 Revision
Stan Marsh, Southern California Edison
- 2) Meteorological Aspects of Emergency Action Level Schemes:
NUREG 0654 versus NUMARC-007
Brad Harvey, Yankee Atomic Electric Company
- 3) Wind Tunnel Performance Study of Met One (Teledyne Geotech)
Model 1585 Bivane and Model 1564B Cup Anemometer
Matthew Parker, Westinghouse Savannah River Company

Enclosure 1 --- Meeting Summary/Highlights
(Continued)

- 4) A Portable Weather Monitoring System for Mobile Emergency Response Applications
David Katz, Climatronics Corporation
- 5) A Standard for Auditing of Meteorological Monitoring Systems
Jim Holian, Spectrum Environmental Sciences, Inc.
- 6) Meteorological Monitoring Design and Operations at the Savannah River Site
Matthew Parker, Westinghouse Savannah River Company
- 7) Climatology of Quarterly Meteorological Data and Implications for Instrumentation and Dose Assessment
Doyle Pitman, Tennessee Valley Authority
- 8) Incorporating Uncertainty into Dispersion Calculations
Larry Gautney, Tennessee Valley Authority
- 9) Application of a Nested Grid Transport and Diffusion Model for Diablo Canyon
Jerry Allwine, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories
- 10) Emergency Preparedness and Response: A Meteorological Perspective
Steven Pfaff, Keen College of New Jersey
- 11) The Role of the LLNL Atmospheric Release Advisory Capability in a FRMAC Response to a Nuclear Power Plant Incident
Ron Baskett, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories
- 12) Operational Mesoscale Dispersion Forecasting at the Kennedy Space Center
Walter Lyons, Forensic Meteorology Associates
- 13) Using Statistical Control Charts in Support of a Meteorological Quality Assurance Program
Paul Schwartz, GPU Nuclear Corporation
- 14) Software Quality Assurance at TVA
Kenneth Wastrack, Tennessee Valley Authority

In addition to the papers presented above, Nick Keener of Duke Power led several open discussions on such topics as reconvening of the ANSI 2.5 Subcommittee, QA/QC of meteorological programs, and monitoring program cost comparisons. Also, Paul Fransioli of SAIC gave a brief status update of the current and future activities of the ASTM.

Enclosure 1 — Meeting Summary/Highlights
(Continued)

During the business meeting and luncheon at the completion of the second day, incoming and outgoing members of the Steering Committee were recognized. The efforts of three outgoing members were applauded: Stan Marsh of Southern California Edison Company, who has served as Committee Lead in the last three years; Brad Harvey of Yankee Atomic Electric Company; and Nick Keener of Duke Power Company. Three new members were chosen to the Committee: Stan Krivo of Dames and Moore; Tom Galletta of Niagara Mohawk; and Marvin Hayden of Duke Power Company. They will join the two returning members of the Committee: Jim Holian of Spectrum Environmental Sciences Inc., and Gene Shelar of Pacific Gas and Electric, who agreed to serve as Committee Lead (Chair).

Evaluation forms were passed out and returned at the end of this meeting. The results of these evaluation will be used to shape the topics and discussions for the next meeting. The next NUMUG meeting will likely be held in April or May 1996. The evaluations asked for volunteers to host this future meeting. If you were not able to attend the October meeting in Charlotte but would be interested in hosting the 1996 meeting, please contact a Steering Committee member.

Jim Holian
NUMUG Steering Committee

Enclosure 2 — Meeting Evaluation Summary

**NUCLEAR UTILITY METEOROLOGICAL DATA USERS GROUP MEETING
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
OCTOBER 20 & 21, 1994**

1) What did you expect to gain from the NUMUG meeting?

- 16 meet contacts from other utilities
- 14 share information, gain knowledge
- 10 NRC guidance, standards
- 6 other utilities experience
- 5 data processing and analysis
- 5 emergency plans and info
- 4 new technologies
- 3 problem areas
- 1 applications of met data
- 1 changing regulations
- 1 equipment problems
- 1 workshop

2) How do you rate the quality of the speakers and the program content?

- | | |
|--------------|--------|
| 9 Excellent | 0 Fair |
| 25 Very Good | 0 Poor |
| 6 Good | |

3) What would you change about the meeting?

- 19 nothing
- 5 adhere to timely schedule
- 4 more panel or open discussions w/group interaction
- 3 extend meeting 1 or 2 days
- 3 NRC representation
- 2 name tags at reception
- 2 more informal, address questions during presentations
- 2 larger meeting room
- 2 More instrumentation info (I&C representation)
- 1 invite contractors/consultants
- 1 more presentations, one per speaker

Enclosure 2 --- Meeting Evaluation Summary
(Continued)

4) How do you rate the meeting facilities and accommodations?

30 Excellent 0 Fair
8 Very Good 0 Poor
1 Good

Comment: No government rate available

5) What future topics or issues would you like to see addressed by NUMUG?

(1 = not very important, 5 = very important)

	1	2	3	4	5
Collection parameters and techniques	0	3	7	10	20
Dispersion modeling	0	2	8	16	12
NRC guidance/interpretation	0	1	9	17	12
Industry standardization	0	4	8	13	14
ANSI standards	0	2	12	15	11
Computer software development	0	7	9	16	7
Development of QA/QC plans	1	4	15	14	5
Hardware forecasting for Emergency Resp	1	4	11	15	8
NWS modernization plan	1	6	23	5	5
FSAR	3	9	15	7	3
New technologies	0	2	2	17	18
Data networking	0	4	13	8	12
other topics	0	0	4	4	6

- Other Topics: Conduct a dispersion modeling survey
(applications, characteristics, improvements, etc)
Experience with ERDS
Session on networking and Internet for Emergency Response
Control room habitability evaluation
Comparison of ISO 9000 with US QA Requirements
(Hardware, software and derived products)
Data collection problems
Have NRC representative speak
Meteorological data acquisition techniques, methods (ie. Internet)

Enclosure 2 -- Meeting Evaluation Summary
(Continued)

6) I am interested in possibly assisting NUMUG through:

* Planning and organizing activities for future meetings and communications?

14 = Yes 16 = No 2 = Maybe

* Having my utility host a meeting

1 = Yes 29 = No 1 = Maybe

* Speaking at a future meeting

23 = Yes 10 = No 1 = Maybe

Additional Comments:

Have next meeting in the West (California)
Enjoyed presentations showing specific natural met events
Have name tags available at Reception
Gain Federal FRMAC support for automated data distribution
(such as through the Emergency Response Data System)
Interaction among members continues to be the
strength of NUMUG
Submit NUMUG meeting highlights to AMS Bulletin
Evaluate differences between dose assessment models and
NRC model "RASCAL"
Adhere to schedule, but allow more time for open discussions
Excellent meeting facilities, lodging and meals