



DOCKETED
USING

1

Duke Power Company
A Duke Energy Company
EC07H
526 South Church Street
P.O. Box 1006
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

'00 JUL 26 AS 130

M. S. Tuckman
*Executive Vice President
Nuclear Generation*

(704) 382-2200 OFFICE
(704) 382-4360 FAX

July 18, 2000

RECEIVED
18 July 00
2:45 pm

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE **PR 72**
(65FR38794)

Mr. David L. Meyer, Chief
Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mail Stop T-6 D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Subject: Comments on Proposed Amendment 10CFR 72.214
Transnuclear-West, Inc; Certificate of Compliance
1004, Amendment 2
65FR38794, dated June 22, 2000

Dear Mr. Meyer:

Duke Energy offers the attached comments relative to the solicitation for public comments regarding the proposed amendment to 10CFR 72.214 regarding Transnuclear-West Certificate of Compliance 1004, Amendment 2.

Please address any questions to Jeff Thomas at (704) 382-5826.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Very truly yours,

M. S. Tuckman

10CFR 72.214
Certificate of Compliance 1004, Amendment 2
Duke Comments

Duke Power Company supports the proposed amendment to 10CFR 72.214 regarding Transnuclear-West Certificate of Compliance 1004, Amendment 2.

The new fuel qualification table eliminates need for each cask user to perform its own decay heat and dose rate calculations. The fuel qualification process is simplified for the utilities and high quality calculations have been ensured by NRC review. Additionally, the new fuel qualification table permits storage of fuel with burnups up to 45 GWD/MTU with appropriately lengthened cooling periods. This ensures safety and health of the public with respect to offsite exposures and better fits current reactor core designs.

The only viable alternative to storing Burnable Poison Rod Assemblies in the dry storage canister is to dispose of them as Low Level Waste. The Burnable Poison Rod Assemblies would need to be segmented, compacted, and placed in separate disposal containers for shipment to a Low Level Waste facility. Such operations would result in additional radiological exposure to the involved workers, are an ineffective use of waste burial space (two containers verses one container), and would be prohibitively expensive.