DCD/DCB

MAY 19 1992

R

MEMORANDUM FOR: Region III Files

FROM: Roy J. Caniano, Chief, Fuel Facilities and Contaminated Sites Section

SUBJECT: APRIL 21, 1992 PUBLIC MEETING REGARDING COMBUSTION ENGINEERING, HEMATITE, MO
LICENSE NO. SNM-33
DOCKET NO. 070-0036

On April 21, 1992, a Public meeting was held at the Jefferson College, Hillsboro, Missouri, to discuss the consolidation plans for Combustion Engineering. This meeting was held at the request of Mrs. Martha Dodson, a private citizen with interest in the Combustion Engineering site. Approximately 75 people were present in the audience for the meeting. Participating in the meeting from the NRC were myself, Charles E. Norelius, John Hickey, and George France. The principal participant from the licensee was James Rode, Plant Manager; however, other Combustion Engineering management personnel were also present. Attached to this memorandum is a copy of the transcript from that meeting. Although there are some typographical errors in the transcript, the overall document is an accurate representation of the meeting. As can be seen in the transcript there were a limited amount of questions on the actual consolidation plan. One issue which did arise at that meeting pertained to a request for the establishment of a Public Document Room in the vicinity of Hematite, Mo. This matter will be pursued by Mr. Hickey.

Prior to the meeting, the aforementioned NRC staff members visited the Combustion Engineering site for a tour and general discussions of plant operations. The tour was headed by Mr. James Rode. During discussions with the licensee, the NRC staff was provided with a general overview of planned activities at the site. The licensee also offered an invitation to NRC staff members to visit the Combustion Engineering, Windsor, CT facility to observe a pilot fuel fabrications system similar to one which will be utilized at Hematite, MO. The NRC staff indicated that such a visit would be beneficial.

L-69

IE07

Subsequent to this meeting, feedback received from licensee representatives was that the meeting was positively received by the audience.

Attachment: As stated

Roy J. Caniano, Chief,
Fuel Facilities and
Contaminated Sites Section

cc w/attachment:
DCD/DCB/RIDS
License File SNM-33
C.E. Norelius, RIII
J.Strasma, RIII
G. France, RIII
J. Hickey, NMSS

cc w/o attachment:
J. A. Grobe, RIII

RIII
Caniano/dh
05/18/92

PUBLIC MEETING

April 21, 1992

Place: Jefferson College

Hillsboro, Missouri

Present:

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Charles Norelius

John Hickey

Roy Canniano

George France

Combustion Engineer, Asea Brown Boveri:

James Rode

Hillsboro Reporting Company

P.O. Box 485

Hillsboro, Mo. 63050

789-2684

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY

P.O. BOX 485

HILLSBORO, MISSOURI 63050

789-2684

MR. NORELIUS: Good evening. My name is Charles Norelius and I'm the director of the Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards in N.C.R. Region Three's office located near Chicago. The purpose of our meeting tonight is to provide you with information regarding the proposed construction of a new fuel rod and bundle assembly building at Combustion Engineering's facility here in Hematite. These operations, which are now being carried out principally in their Windsor, Connecticut plant are to be transferred to Hematite and consolidated as part of a planned program for fuel manufacturing operations here at Hematite. We are aware of the public's interest of activities that occur at the Hematite facility. We held a public meeting previously in this room in August of 1989 to discuss a previous expansion of the operations at the plant and some months ago Mrs. Martha Dodson of this area requested that we conduct a similar public meeting and that is why we're here tonight. I have several people from our staff here to participate in the meeting from the N.C.R. staff Chicago. I'll introduce, first, to my immediate left is George France. George is our principal project inspector for the plant here in Hematite and he's been inspecting down here for, I believe, about eight years, right, George? So he's very familiar with the activities and has followed them closely over several years. To George's left is John

Hickey. John is out of our Washington D.C. headquarters. John is the chief of the fuel cycle safety branch and he has the responsibility for the licensing of the plant here and will be talking about some proposed changes. And those amendments will have to be, those changes that are proposed will have to be reviewed by Mr. Hickey and his branch and he'll be describing a bit of how they do that in terms of licensing activities. And to his left is Roy Caniano. Roy is also from our office in Chicago. Roy is chief of our fuel facilities and contaminated site sections. He has overall responsibility for inspection here and Roy will be describing a little later on our inspection process and how that applies here. The combination of licensing and inspection are the mechanisms that the N.C.R. uses to assure that proposed uses of radioactive material can be carried out with due regard for public health and safety. We want to note that in the near future you will start to see some construction of the new facilities where the new work is going to be conducted. But we want to make it clear that no radioactive materials can actually be used there until such time as the company submits to us an amendment describing the process and we approve that process. So that has to be done before actual work with radioactive materials can be done, can be carried out there. Recognizing that the project is in its early stages tonight we can only describe

what is planned to be done and our process for approving it. Upon completion of construction and after approval of the operations we from the N.C.R. will be available for another meeting, if there is public sentiment to do so. And the company has also indicated to us a very strong willingness and desire also to participate in the second meeting, if that is so indicated. We are what we plan to do this evening is first to have a presentation from the Combustion Engineering plant manager here at Hematite, Mr. James Rode, and he will discuss the proposed changes at the facility. After his presentation we will allow some time for questions or comments and after we do that for awhile then we from the N.C.R. will describe our licensing and inspection process and after that we will take additional questions. So with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Rode.

MR. RODE: I'm happy to be here to talk to you about one of my favorite topics, the Hematite plant. It has a rich history and I would like to share a few of the highlights with you. The plant was built in 1956. It's the first commercial nuclear fuel plant in the world. I was part of the start up team. We started the plant with thirteen employees in 1956 primarily producing development quantities of uranium for everyone with visions of a future powered by nuclear reactors and a desire to participate in that growing future. During the next eighteen years the

plant was involved in supplying everyone in the nuclear industry. Although the operations were entirely commercial, much of our production was associated with defense programs. Much of our work was classified. This earned us a reputation for secrecy. The reputation for secrecy remains with us today, though, we are happy to discuss our operations with the public and have conducted many public tours during the last five years. Perhaps this meeting will remove some of the mystery from our operations and some of the concerns that the public has. In 1974 Combustion Engineering purchased the Hematite plant and terminated the processing of all high enriched uranium. The plant work force then had grown to fifty-six employees. They were redirected exclusively to the production of fuel for the utility power market. Companies like Union Electric. In the spring of 1980 Combustion Engineering began an aggressive modernization program which resulted in the transfer of fuel pellet production from Connecticut to Jefferson County. Our employment at the start of this was seventy-eight. When A.B.B. assumed control in 1990 our employment had increased to a hundred and five. Then by the end of our modernization program our employment has increased to a hundred and sixteen. Now we're undertaking a consolidation program that will bring additional jobs to Jefferson County. We expect to have an employment of a

hundred and sixty-five in 1993. One thing remains constant over the thirty-six year history, change. The fuel design, the specification processes and equipment used for manufacturing have all changed resulting in higher productivity, safer operations. The regulatory requirements have also changed providing the driving force for constant improvements in our operations. Operations in our industry that could not or would not adapt to the changing environment have passed away with the dinosaurs. The Hematite plant has, however, evolved right along with the changes in the industry and we're bringing new jobs to the area. A few years ago our business was focused soley on the U.S.. In the 1990's our business focus, like many others, has changed. We're in a worldwide business in every sense of the word. Today our supplies of enriched uranium and equipment come from around the globe. Our competition for business here and overseas is not limited to U.S. companies. It is our intent to provide a world class plan for the production of nuclear fuel here in Jefferson County so we can remain competetive in the market. Our plant site is centered in a hundred and fifty-five acre plat of ground in the valley of Joachim Creek. The plant site itself consists of about ten acres. The area under roof is about eighty thousand square feet at this time. We're expecting that consolidation will add fifty percent to the area under roof.

With the existing plant here, the new rod load and assembly building will be added here next to the creek and this will be a parking lot where shipping containers will be stored behind the plant. It's our anticipation that we will provide landscaping along the front and along this side to seal the plant from the road. We're planning to construct an automated fuel assembly or if you prefer, as people of the planning and zoning commission referred to it, a packaging facility in the plant which will add about fifty jobs. Prior to modernization efforts in 1989 the Hematite plant received uranium as a solid in steel containers. The UF6 was converted to UO2 powder and the powder was shipped to the Connecticut facility for production of pellets and later for packaging in fuel rods and then into fuel assemblies. Today we have added the processing of pellets and we are today shipping finished pellets to Connecticut. It is our plan to transfer the loading of pellets and to ship it in the future in shipping cages directly to the utilities. The converse process which we now operate results from the reaction of steamed ammonia and uranium, hexaflouride, which are mixed in hot fluidized beds. The product is UO2 powder. The product gasses are passed through a bed of crushed limestone to remove the acid. The remaining gasses, steam and carbon dioxide are released to the environment. The uranium dioxide is then milled and

blended, pressed, sintered, ground to dimensions and inspected . The inspected pellets will be loaded into metal tubing, sealed by welding, assembled into fuel cages, inspected and sealed for shipments to our customers, American nuclear utilities. I believe the planned consolidation work at Hematite is the usual win, win opportunity. A.B.B. Combustion Engineering will have a more efficient fuel production operation with all your uranium operations located in a single site here in Jefferson County. Jefferson County will reap the benefits of additional employment and additional tax base with virtually no affect on the environment. Be happy to answer any questions. You want to take over?

MR. NORELIUS: If someone has questions, we're relatively a small group so I would just as soon keep it somewhat informal but what I would ask is that if you have a question, we ask that you give your name and home town where you live and then if you have a question or want to make a comment, either one, you're welcome to do so. Yes, sir.

DENNIS WARDEN: Dennis Warden.

MR. NORELIUS: A little louder, please?

DENNIS WARDEN: What do you do with your waste water?

MR. NORELIUS: Could you give your name,

again, please?

DENNIS WARDEN: Dennis Warden from Hematite.

MR. NORELIUS: Okay.

MR. RODE: Our waste water, it goes through a sanitary treatment plant and is then treated to conform to the Missouri D.N.R. requirements and discharged.

DENNIS WARDEN: Discharged where?

MR. RODE: Down stream from our pond.

DENNIS WARDEN: You have a pond and not a tank? What I'm saying is the conduit or in the dirt or just a pond?

MR. RODE: We discharge in the stream from the spring that flows down to Joachim Creek after treatment in the sewage plant.

DENNIS WARDEN: You don't contain it very long in the pond or anything like that before you send it out?

MR. RODE: You realize I'm talking, I understood your question to be addressed to our sanitary waste water. Our sanitary waste water is treated in a sanitary, in an approved sanitation plant and discharged to the stream. Now that is not, has nothing to do with the processing.

DENNIS WARDEN: What do you do with the processing water for your cooling and that?

MR. RODE: Okay. Our processing water is

evaporated, concentrated and fixed with steam and shipped to burial grounds. We do not generate a great deal of water, however, our process is a dry process for the conversion of UF6 to pellets. We are feeding gas, gasses into a fluidized bed reactor and reacting them. We don't have alot of liquid.

DENNIS WARDEN: Now, on the lime, as you are talking about limestone you were forcing the water through the limestone as a filter earlier.

MR. RODE: No, that's gasses--

DENNIS WARDEN: What do you do with the limestone after you get done with it? Do you have to change it every year or so?

MR. RODE: The limestone, we take a sample of, charge of limetone. We mill it to a fine powder and then count it to determine if there is any significant activity associated with it. After that we are storing it, we expect that we will receive permission to use it as fill material on site. The general level of it is only slightly above background and well within the deminimus quantity, deminimus concentrations which are spelled out at this point in the regulations.

MAURICE NUCKUS: My name is Maurice Nuckus. I live within five feet of the plant and first I want to compliment Mr. Rode on the way he keeps the outside grounds

and the plant and we hope he don't retire for along time. Second, my question is addressed to Mr. Rode, I would like to know how many fans there will be on top of the plant and how much emissions there will be from this new plant?

MR. RODE: Our current plans are not to have any blowers on top of the plant in the future. There will be a separate building. There will be one additional blower and filter and that will be housed within the building. We have had some difficulties with our filtration systems when we put them on the roof. We have found it far more practical to house it indoors and I'm sure our neighbors feel the same way about it because I have heard comments that the number of blowers that we have are becoming a source of quite a bit of noise in Hematite. We're sensitive to that but we're also sensitive to the fact that having our filters and blowers out of doors presents a major problem to our maintenance staff in keeping them operational, particularly in colds weather. You may not appreciate it but our people do.

MR. NUCKUS: How much emissions will there be from this?

MR. RODE: It's hard to say what the emissions will be. We, based on our experience in the addition of the pellet plant, there will be very little increase and we expect to upgrade the rest of our plant

sufficiently so that there will probably be no increase, most likely a decrease in emissions as a result of this. We can't say that with certainty but that appears to be the case based on our experience with the previous work on expanding the pellet plant.

MR. NUCKUS: Thank you.

MR. NORELIUS: Any other questions?

MARTHA DODSON: I'm Martha Dodson. I'm from Crystal City. Mr. Rode, you said that you filtered everything through these limestone filters; is that correct, and the remaining gasses are released to the atmosphere. Could you tell us exactly what those remaining gasses are?

MR. RODE: I skipped over that. Primarily we are dealing with steam and carbon dioxide. It is not filtered through the limestone exactly. The purpose of the limestone is the acid reacts with the limestone and the limestone neutralizes the acid forming, converting some of the rock to calcium flouride, which is a naturally occurring mineral of, the pharmal mineral is flourispar. There is some hydrofluoric acids remaining in off gas stream, however, I would point out that that's really not the subject of the license amendment that will be submitted that is subject of our current operating license rather than any change at this point.

MARTHA DODSON: Oh, I understand that.

MR. NORELIUS: Yes, ma'am.

BEVERLY WARDEN: My name is Beverly Warden from Hematite and I was wondering if it would increase the traffic on P Highway? Are we going to have alot of trucks coming out that way or is it going to be done mostly by rail?

MR. RODE: We have probably close to as much traffic today as we have in the future. It will be distributed a little differently. Right now we are shipping products weekly or several times a week in this case. When we ship fuel to utilities it will probably be bunched because they schedule an outage and want the fuel delivered in a relatively short period of time. The overall affect probably will be minor, though, you are not talking about that many trucks, to be perfectly fair about it. The trucks that you see are probably quite large and they can be a problem but that is, that does not represent a change from what the situation is today really.

BEVERLY WARDEN: I have one more concern and if something would happen, like to give an example, in the past we tried to get home and we were stop at the intersection of A and P and all we were told is that they had a nuclear accident. Our children were at home, that's all we could be told. We had to go back in town and call them. Is there going to be any kind of alarm system if

something would happen we would have the decision, rather than to leave or to stay we would have that option. I mean, I understand in the past it wasn't, supposedly it wasn't anything really emitted but I think we should have the option or some kind of an alarm system, if you have any plans to have that? Some kind of a siren or something you could blow in case there would be an accident?

MR. RODE: Well, ma'am, there is an alarm on our plant that some of our neighbors can hear, I'm sure. The problem is that under most, under the conceivable accident scenarios generally it would not be warranted and, in fact, would not be wise for you to leave your home. You would be better off to stay in your home rather than to be exposed in the course of trying to get out of the area. And I believe this has been discussed. Some of the people from the N.C.R. might like to comment on that but I doubt that you would get out before a problem got to you and most of the problems that would occur would be over very quickly. It would be hard for you to avoid the problem. We are not talking general. This is not bombs that we are dealing with. This is not something that is that catastrophic and you would generally be better off to stay in your home.

BEVERLY WARDEN: For how long when we don't know what is going on. I mean, we didn't, the people that were at home didn't even know anything about it. We knew

about it because we tried to get home and we were stopped but, I mean, we wouldn't be notified until it was evening.

MR. NORELIUS: Maybe I can comment a bit from our perspective for emergency planning purposes. We have one type of plans that we would require, for example, at a nuclear power plant and in that case we would require a detailed emergency plan, which would include sirens and plan for evacuation and this sort of thing. The problems at the Hematite facility are much different than that and there is not, what we call a source term there, sufficient quantities of radioactive materials that we could see being released in an accident that would warrant that kind of an emergency plan. So the emergency plans that we require for a plant such as this one are very similar to what would be required under any normal kind of fire and police action, if you will. If you have a fire in a local area, the local fire department and police department would normally determine what is the best action to take. In other words, if there were a major fire at a location they might determine which roads to block off, whether people should be in the immediate vicinity or not. And so the plans that we require for this plant are more along that nature that we believe can be best handled through the normal actions of local police and fire department. Now, the plans do require that the plant provide information and guidance and training to

the local police and fire departments to help them understand what is there, okay. Any other questions for Mr. Rode?

MARTHA DODSON: I have one more. Mr. Rode said that with the expanded plant that the rods would be packed and would be shipped to the customers. How does that shipping occur? Is it all truck or is there rail involved and then there is a follow up question.

MR. RODE: You have that slide of the truck with the shipping cages? This is what the truck looks like and these are the shipping cages. They are required to meet the same impact, fire emersion standards as our present oxide shipping cages. They additionally have another level of containment beyond that which we have currently on our pellets. This is the kind of fuel assembly that we will be shipping inside those shipping containers. If you imagine this thirteen feet long, this is what those tubes look like so you have all of the activity encased within a rod, in addition that is within the shipping container itself.

MARTHA DODSON: Okay. From Hematite to customer's truck or is there rail involved?

MR. RODE: It is by truck.

MARTHA DODSON: No rail?

MR. RODE: No rail.

MARTHA DODSON: And when I visited with you

we discussed that you're supplying fuel to Yankee Ray. Yankee Ray is no more.

MR. RODE: That's true.

MARTHA DODSON: I wonder we talking about export here?

MR. RODE: We are not generally talking about export. There is a possibility of export in the future. Primarily I think we have potential committments to one customer in Korea. That is not firm business. I don't know how actively we are pursuing for other firm business but there is a possibility that it would be pursued. It's hard. We are participating in a worldwide market which is changing very rapidly. The changes are not all initiated by our company. We have to respond to the market place.

MARTHA DODSON: Surely appreciate that and your company is multi-national. Then a question, follow up question to N.C.R., someone on the N.C.R.. There were previously and I'm not sure of dates, whatever, there were previously regulations against the exportation of uranium. What changes have occurred?

MR. HICKEY: I think, I'm John Hickey again from N.C.R. headquarters in Washington. I'm not sure what changes you are referring to. There are restrictions on export of enriched uranium and they are designed to keep the uranium from falling into the hands of unfriendly

governments, so to speak. And A.B.B. would be expected to abide by those regulations. But there are people supporting nuclear fuel now so it wouldn't be an unprecidented type of operation.

MARTHA DODSON: Thank you.

MR. NORELIUS: Okay. Any other questions for Mr. Rode at this point?

HERB BEALEY: It's not a question, my name is Herb Bealey and I'm from A.B.& B. and I would like Mr. Rode to explain to them the advantages of sending the bundles out as opposed to sending out the individual shipments that we are talking about before they go into the bundles.

MR. RODE: Well, as I pointed out one of the major advantages is that you have another level of containment within the fuel rods. A matter of a few months ago there was an accident not involving a cage of the type that we will be using, that occurred in Massachusetts, I believe. And there was a major fire, the fire department did not attempt to extinguish it but there was no loss of any activity from the fuel because the fuel rods themselves retained all of the activity within the fuel assembly, even though in that case I believe the shipping cages were wooden shipping cages and our shipping cages are not wooden cages. They are designed to withstand fire and impact.

MR. NORELIUS: Okay. I believe we will

move on and I will ask John Hickey to come and describe our licensing process and reviews that we do there and then we'll talk about the inspection process and then we'll have an opportunity for some more questions after that. John.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Chuck. What I would like to do very briefly is just go over the N.C.R. review procedures. As Chuck mentioned, I'm chief of the fuel cycle branch and I'm from N.C.R. headquarters in Washington. The remainder of our contingency is from our Chicago office. We have not received the license application yet for this particular addition and as Chuck mentioned they will not be allowed to process nuclear material in the facility. They have applied for an amendment and are successful in gaining the amendment and I would like to explain how that procedure works. When they submit the application we conduct, we break our review, for convenience of terminology into two parts. One we call the environmental review and the safety review. And there is some overlap. The environmental review is concerned more with off site impact, although, there is some consideration of on site impact, the traffic and the amount of land that is taken up. But we also look at emissions and waste generation and what is going to happen to the waste and whether there is any increase emissions or what emmissions will come from the new facilities and also what the

incremental affects will be over and above the existing facility. We take into account the total impact of the entire plant, if they do add on to the plant. The safety review is more concerned with what happens on site protecting the workers from radioactive contamination, inhalation of radioactive material that might be in the air but it's also concerned with off site impact in terms of what liquid might be released from the facility and people asked about airborne emissions and what airborne emissions will result and what the radiological impact might be off site. Some specific examples would be we would look at their ventilation and infiltration systems to make sure the air is safe both what the workers are exposed to in the plant and the air that is released off site. Another example would be a criticality safety review. A criticality accident can occur if too much uranium or fuel is brought together in a small volume, a large mass in a small volume you can have what is call a criticality accident, which emits a large dose of radiation and can even cause a fatal accident. And we can, the licensee has to have procedures in place to make sure the uranium is kept in small amounts separated so that that type of an accident cannot occur. So overall with the review looks at the proceedures and the equipment that the licensee has in place to make sure there are no safety or environmental problems. We also look at

the people that are working in the plant and their qualifications and we will do, although, in this case we already, since there is already a plant there we already know alot about the people and the qualifications. Now, after we do the initial review we will have questions and concerns that we will bring to the licensee and we may have meetings. If we do, they are open to the public. They won't be conducted in this manner but they will be open for observation by the public. And we also generally send questions, written questions to the licensee and the licensee is expected to answer those questions to our satisfaction. And all of that correspondence, all are ongoing correspondence between us and the licensee is open to public inspection and the, we have here what we call a local public document room that correspondence will be maintained and it's in a local public library. Which library, is it the Festus Library?

MR. RODE: I'm not sure whether there is any in the local library as opposed to the Washington University Library, I think there is a depository.

MARTHA DODSON: Wash U.

MR. HICKEY: I'm sorry, it's the Wash U. local public document room and, of course, the correspondence is available in Washington but many of you are not going to want to go to Washington. Maybe you don't want to go to

Washington anyway but if you did, it wouldn't be to look at this correspondence. And after they have addressed our questions we conduct what we call our final reviews. We do an environmental assessment and if our findings are favorable we publish a federal register notice and that puts the public on notice that we are about to make a decision with respect to the safety and environmental impacts of the addition to the plant. And at that time, as Chuck mentioned, we would plan on having a public meeting assuming that there is interest and we would anticipate interest and we would consider the public comments that we received from that, that public meeting and any written comments that we receive and then we would take a final licensing action and the licensing action is favorable, only then would they be permitted to introduce radioactive material or process radioactive material in this building to that's a quick overview of the process and I think we would like to have Roy Caniano from our region three office say a few words about our inspection program and then we will be happy to take any questions that you may have.

MR. CANIANO: Thank you, John. As I was introduced earlier, I'm Roy Caniano. I'm the chief of the fuel facility and contaminated site section in the N.C.R. region three office in Glen Ellyn, Illinois. What I would like to do is spend a few moments here describing to you our

inspection program that we have established at Combustion Engineering and what some of our plans are for the future with regards to the inspection efforts. Our inspection program for Combustion Engineering requires the region to perform periodic inspections in specific subject areas. I have listed a few of these areas for you here and I would like to briefly discuss a couple of the more pertinent ones. The areas include radiation protection, environmental protection, management and organizational controls that are in place at Combustion Engineering, quality assurance programs, operations review, by that would be mainly review of incidents, abnormal occurrences that may have occurred over the inspection period. Nuclear criticality control, which Mr. Hickey just briefly described. Fire protection programs that is in place at the plant, emergency preparedness programs, transportation of radioactive materials, training and retraining of staff, maintenance and surveillance testing and waste management. I'll take a few of these subject areas here and briefly describe specifically what we would look into. The first one we see up there is radiation protection. The licensee, Combustion Engineering, is required to have a radiation protection program at the plant. This requires periodic monitoring of the staff that work at the plant for not only the external hazards that maybe associated with the activities at the

facility but also with any internal type of inhalation, say, for example, and we monitor that program. The whole purpose is to assure that staff numbers at the plant do not receive radiation exposure, which are in excess of our limits. The licensee is also required to do periodic radiation surveys both internally and external to the plant. They are required to perform environmental monitoring. I know there were a couple of questions earlier with regards to the effluent, what is coming out of the stack at Combustion Engineering. We will review that licensee's program and not only will we review it via paper trail mechanism but we normally will take random samples. We'll actually go out and take environmental samples, which we would have done in the past. We will do independent type of surveys, radiation surveys. The whole purpose for that is that now we are not just relying on the licensee's results. We are actually doing a cross examination and submit samples, we'll call it, to make sure the results in fact are what they say they are on the record. We also take a look at other areas. Pick a couple of them over here, transportation, that was another question that came up. Transportation and waste management we routinely look at. What do we look at when we look at waste. We look at the packaging of the waste. We look at the classification of the waste. We take a look at the documentation. We will actually examine packages that are

on site that maybe ready for transport to make sure that they were, in fact, labeled properly and they have been packaged properly. Transportation which maybe going. Currently some of the pellets that are leaving the plant right now that are going to Windsor for some of their final preparation, we will review that documentation and, again, if available, if there are packages that are there, we will take a look at those packages. Waste, there was a question that came up earlier with regards to material that maybe going into the stream. We have in the past at Combustion Engineering actually taken samplesm environmental samples again for assurance that is there no hazards that are being released into the stream. And that's a program that we have established and we're going to continue those efforts. Emergency preparedness, not only do we review the licensee's emergency preparedness program because in that program they are required to have periodic drills within the plant itself. We also in the past have actually participated in emergency response exercises, in fact, we have participated to the extent where we have, via playing mechanism, activated our incident response center back in region three, where we have actually dispatched various members of our region three staff, who have come to the site and became quite familiar with the barns, which are right along adjacent to the highway over there. And, you know, again,

we plan on doing that again in the future. Other areas that we routinely look at are training and retraining, very important aspect of our inspection program. When new staff comes on board we want to assure ourselves that they have, in fact, been trained in accordance with our regulations and in accordance with the licensee's program that they submitted to the N.C.R. and indicated to us that this is the mechanism that we are going to our employees. So these are some of the areas that we routinely will take a look into with regards to the new construction that's anticipated at Combustion Engineering. One of the areas which we plan on focusing on, is going to end up being fourth item on there, which is the quality assurance program. Very key point. We will review alot of management off site responsibilities at the plant. What type of quality assurances, what programs do the have in place. Again, it's for the protection of the employees, the environment, etcetera. In recent times sime of our inspection efforts ave changed. In the past we did in my mind a lot of compliance type inspections. We have changed that philosophy. The focus now is on safety inspections, the emphasis is on safety. It's our performance based inspections. That require our inspectors, when they go to a plant, they can easily sit down and review records and they usually should be able to get a feel of what the licensee's performance is. We're expanding that a

little bit right now. What we routinely do now is we get into the plant, actually observe operations, routine and non-routine type of operations. We talk to more people when we review a record and we see that the licensee indicated an X amount of release to the environment for the month of March, 1992, for example. We don't just rely on that. We'll go talk to the people who generated the record, how did you actually come up with this data. We're attempting to do more split sampling with licensees. Again, as I previously mentioned if a licensee takes an environmental sample outside the plant perimeter and indicates that there was no presence of radioactive materials there, we have in the past and we plan on continuing taking those environmental type of samples and again it's an additional assurance for the N.C.R. and I think to the public of the operations of the plant. Our principal goal in performing these inspections is to assure the protection of employees and members of the general public and the environment from the radiological hazards that are associated with plant operations. These inspections at least that region thru conducts at the site are performed at varying frequencies. We may not necessarily in one inspection trip cover each of the areas that are on the overhead. Our own region three inspector, George France, is responsible for performing the on site inspections at Combustion Engineering. Over the

past two years our average inspection effort has been at least one on site inspection each calendar quarter. In addition to our own fuel facilities inspector we also rely on the expertise of others. Just recently, for example, at Combustion Engineering we did a maintenance type of inspection participation. In that inspection in addition to Mr. France was someone from our reactor program in region three who had expertise in the area of maintenance. In addition, we have also invited and a few agencies, in fact, have participated, I should say the outside agencies that we have invited to participate in our inspection efforts so that has been on site. I believe, E.P.A. has also been on site. We make it a point during each of our inspection activities, in fact, we have a requirement that we must notify the state of all planned inspections. And we do provide the state an opportunity, if they wish, to participate in our inspection efforts. Over the past two years region three has performed twelve inspections at Combustion Engineering. These include routine and non-routine inspections. Non-routine in the event of a release, in the event of an over exposure, say, for example, that would need to get reported to the N.C.R.. Those are some types of examples where we would show up on a non-routine basis. We have also completed two emergency response type inspections over the past two years at

Combustion Engineering. The results of the inspections so far for the past two years resulted in two violations and a few minor areas of concern. We have been pleased with the licensee's response to the violations. We believe that they are pro-active in responding and take aggressive corrective actions to prevent recurrence of violations and/or areas of concerns. With the expansion proposal that Combustion Engineering is anticipating that our inspection efforts are going to continue and we probably are going to enhance our inspection efforts. This enhancement of our efforts are not only going to be once operations begin but we feel right now that we will be reviewing a lot of information with regards to the licensee's application when they do submit it. We are planning to perform construction type inspections during the initial phases. Some of the areas which we feel that we are going to be reviewing and paying close attention, one, of course is the quality assurance program that I previously indicated or mentioned. But the other one is in their operations. The licensee is going to be required to submit to us detail descriptions of safety equipment that is going to be within the new facility. For example, fire protection equipment, alarm type systems that are going to be placed in. In ventilation systems what type of filters are going to be in there. We are anticipating that throughout this construction phase we will have N.C.R. on site reviewing

some, if not all, of those areas. We also feel that during the construction activities we may again rely on the expertise from other staff members either from the N.C.R. and or they could be from outside agencies. Headquarters staff has also participated in our inspection activity at Combustion Engineering over the past few years and it's anticipated that they also will be providing some export. One of the things that we really want to assure ourselves is that the information that is provided in the application that Mr. Hickey and his branch will be reviewing, that the materials and the equipment will be installed as indicated in that application. Are there any questions?

JERI MCKEE: I have some questions. My name is Jerry McKee. I'm your neighbor directly to the north. First question, I like it when you come out and test the soil but we raise cattle and horses and is there anyway we can find out the results of the soil testing in words that I would understand. I mean, you are going, I'm sure I could probably find them, like you said, all of these are made public. But you're going to tell me the soil content is this and this. And we ship cattle to market to people all over the United States and we're assuming because you never say it's not safe that they were safe and if the cattle are, should the cattle be tested? Should the people in Hematite be tested for radiation? I'm talking about safety

conditions for the people that work there. I have lived in this area for over twenty years and I know have never been tested.

MR. NORELIUS: There are no requirements we have for testing of individuals or cattle who live in the area. Our program is placed on what is released from the plant so the controls that we exercise are two ways. One is external radiation levels that you can measure with a meter and the other are radioactive materials that maybe emitted from the plant. And those are the two things that we have limits on and that we inspect and so long as the results are within those limits, there is no need for any additional testing of individuals or cattle or whatever on the outside so that's our point of control.

JERI MCKEE: Okay. The next question is I just want a better answer because when they had the small leak and the traffic was shut down I was outside. My children were in the house. And it was like several hours later when we saw all of the news helicopters flying around. That is scary. Is there some way that we can, I mean, just give us a phone call and say, hey, look, it's just a little bitty deal. Traffic has been shut down but it's okay. Maybe you should tell us what the worst is here, Mr. Rode says it's going to be too late for you to walk to your house and get out of here. You're scaring us, people, and if my

children are in the home and I'm outside, are you telling me I'm not going to make it to the house?

MR. NORELIUS: No, let me, Mr. Rode, do you care to respond to that.

MR. RODE: Thanks.

JERI MCKEE: We just want an answer or phone call.

MR. RODE: Of the situation I was trying to describe is, and you alluded to it also, that the amount of activity that would be released is quite small and it is going to pass super quickly. And it is unlikely that evacuation from the area will improve anything. It is more likely to take you into the problem, that is what I was trying to, the point I was trying to get across.

JERI MCKEE: Well, that makes me feel better.

MR. RODE: That's the reason that the road was closed is that there is a relatively short distance from the area that was a matter of concern to the road where it passes immediately past the plant. Now, if we had thought that there was concern for neighbors, we would have a list of our most immediate neighbors and we have a phone system to call them.

JERI MCKEE: That's what I wanted to know.

MR. RODE: We do have that and we do have wind direction and velocity equipment and when we have an

event the instructions are there and the emergency director is supposed to set up a phone system where he will contact the immediate neighbors that might be down wind from the problem.

JERI MCKEE: That is what I wanted to know.

MR. RODE: However. They are not going to contact the entire community because there is not going to be a large enough release that, by the time it has distributed that it is going to cause a problem.

JERI MCKEE: But as your immediate neighbor, I want, I feel like I would be one of the first ones and, like I said, if my children are in the house and I'm outside you kind of left it open there when you said, well, you might not have time to get to your car.

MR. RODE: That isn't quite what I said. I, what I was trying to imply was that it would be a mistake to attempt to evacuate because it wasn't likely really that it was going to help the situation unless you happen to be down wind and received a call from us warning you and we would have a far better knowledge of what the situation is and whether it was advisable than you or probably than anyone else would. Because we do have the equipment to keep track of the wind velocity and the direction as well as we know the magnitude of the release. We tend to be conservative. That is, we will try and warn people if we think there is

any danger. That is the reason that we closed down the road not because there was a problem but we were concerned that there might be a, be problems with the road being closed?

JERI MCKEE: We found that out like three days later but until we knew that everybody was really kind of ify and stepping on egg shells.

MR. RODE: Yes, I can understand that. I have to apologize.

JERI MCKEE: No. Well, once, you know, you understand it there is no problem but it's just until, but I would like to know, yeah, I mean get a phone call if this is coming in any direction so I would have time to leave.

MR. RODE: You can be sure the McKees are--

JERI MCKEE: I don't want it to be for the McKees, I want it to be for the Lucases and Jacksons and everybody but I didn't want to die before I got to the phone.

MR. RODE: I understand. We have a map and we do have phone numbers of the immediate neighbors in the evacuation center with phones so you can be contacted.

MR. NORELIUS: Okay. I believe the gentleman here, did you have a question?

MR. HOWE: No, I was going to refer to the map that was in the evacuation center. It has the people's names listed in the general area so that they know where but

he already covered that so it doesn't matter.

CAROL HOWE: Okay. I have a comment. My name is Carol Howe. My husband works at Combustion Engineering and I just want to make a comment. We appreciate our news media but we also have to remember how frantic they do become and love to thrive on things like this. So when you see the helicopters flying in and emergency crews and so forth from the news media we want to try and focus a little bit, too, on their job and not let it, not let it scare us to death.

MR. NORELIUS: Okay. Yes, sir.

DAVID JARVIS: I live within a thousand feet of the plant. You were talking about these inspections, N.C.R. inspections. Are these all planned or do you ever have any unnannounced spot inspections where you come in un-announced and you take air, water, the measurements and different sorts of things as far as plants and everything. Are all of these planned inspections?

MR. NORELIUS: We plan them but we do come in unannounced. From the N.C.R. we plan periodically to come in and inspect but we do not share that schedule with the licensee.

DAVID JARVIS: You indicate that you share it with the state each time, that's why I wondered if you shared it with A.B.B. each time?

MR. NORELIUS: No, we invite the state along as a matter of working in cooperation with the state. So we tell the state agency and invite them to come along, if they wish, but most of our inspections are un-announced at the plant.

DAVID JARVIS: One other question, is there an air monitor at the plant twenty-four hours a day as far as monitoring the emissions from this plant?

MR. NORELIUS: Yes, and we could describe, maybe you want to describe more of those, Jim?

MR. RODE: In general the emissions from the plant from every stack on the plant are monitored. They are monitored continuously with a few exceptions. The few exceptions are on stacks which are not always in operation. Those may not be monitored when that portion of the plant, when that stack is not in operation. The others are monitored continuously. They are sampled and counted. One of the problems that we do run into, though, is that we are looking for extremely low levels of activity so we have to wait for decay of some of the materials, which are naturally occurring so that we get an accurate count and can see how much of it is due to the operation, due to uranium specifically. We do monitor them, as I recall, and, Hal, you may have better numbers than that but my recollection is that your report is now running several thousand samples per

month.

HAL: Generally we run about ten thousand samples per month of air samples, contamination smears, all types of accounting, about ten thousand a month.

MR. NORELIUS: I assume that number, from what you have said, Hal, is both your internal plant measurements as well as your effluent, right? Just to satisfy a bit, we require, again, as part of our licensing process that they have sufficient detection equipment to monitor a material that is leaving the plant from wherever that might be, process stacks or whatever. And they set up a system, they describe that to us, we would approve the system as part of the licensing process. Then in our routine inspections we will sample, look at their records, make sure the sampling system itself is working and as Roy mentioned, periodically take our own samples to confirm the results, okay. Yes, Mrs. Dodson.

MARTHA DODSON: I would like to direct a question to Mr. Caniano on contaminated sites. I think we all know this is a contaminated site. You mentioned the infamous pick-up truck in the pond. What efforts are being made, I appreciate the fact that the Asea, Brown can't do anything until you guys tell them what to do. What is happening in terms of you guys telling them what to do?

MR. CANIANO: There are currently a number

of, couple of areas on site that are considered to be contaminated areas. One, as you mentioned, is the site where the pick-up truck is buried. That whole area was buried in accordance with our regulations that were in affect at that time under 10CFR part 20. There are also some areas on the site that have, I guess you would call them retention ponds. I believe two of them that is known to contain small amounts of radioactive materials and, in addition, there is an area on site that contain low quantities of radioactive materials that are contained in the limestone. The licensee and we are reviewing this, has a couple of proposals how to remedy the situation. They are currently doing sampling specifically the sampling especially in the old, what I refer to, as the old part twenty burial site. Those are periodic samples that are taken by the licensee. George, I think you can correct me, if I'm wrong, but I believe we also have taken some samples from that area?

MR. FRANCE: Yes.

MR. CANIANO: And one of the things we want to assure is there is no migration of radioactive material from that area. The retention pond areas contain very small amounts was of residual uranium. The total activity, I believe, is in the low millicury amount, which is very small activity. The licensee currently has hired a contractor.

The contractor has done an evaluation of the exact types and quantities of materials that are there and they are proposing a plan which will be submitted to the N.C.R. of those two retention ponds. Those are, that plan will be reviewed by not only the region but our low level waste division in headquarters. We have a few technical policies, I'll call them right now, that if the licensee wishes to leave the material there they have to meet specific criteria. The N.C.R. will perform a detailed review of that proposal.

MRATHA DODSON: What about on site storage, will there be more with the expansion of on site storage on an already contaminated site?

MR. CANIANO: Mr. Rode, I think I'll refer this one to you because we had some discussion on that earlier.

MR. RODE: Well, you're raising very interesting subjects. The storage of low level waste, is what you are referring to?

MARTHA DODSON: Yes.

MR. RODE: The storage of low level waste will not be impacted substantially by the additional hardware packaging operations, which will be added as a result of consolidation. However, as you probably realize the status of disposition of low level waste is very fluid

at this time. The state would like for us to immediately begin constructing an on site storage facility. The N.C.R., at least, some of the commissioners are anxious that we not proceed too rapidly on that. The supreme court is now reviewing a case involving low level waste storage, but what I can say on these issues is we are prepared to provide for on site storage of the low level waste, if that is required. And we have discussed our plan with both the D.N.R. and N.C.R.. But as long as we can ship to burial grounds it is our intent to continue to ship to burial grounds.

MARTHA DODSON: That is really short term, isn't it?

MR. RODE: Well, maybe. That again is also fluid because the state legislature, as I understand it, in South Carolina has indicated a desire to keep their burial ground open to the public as long as they are willing to pay the fee. And, of course, it is a very high fee. And the reason the state legislature would like to keep it open is because it's a very lucrative operation and a source of considerable cash for the state.

MARTHA DODSON: Thank you.

MR. NORELIUS: Your earlier question related somewhat to the handling of contamination on site and I just wanted to add a couple of things that the N.C.R. has done to address this question. One is within the last couple of

years we have implemented a regulation for decommissioned funding plans and each license facility now has to prepare a decommission funding plan to assure that they will have funds available to clean up the residual contamination at such time as they terminate their license. So that is a new initiative and regulation that has been put into place in the last two years. Secondly, the commission has instituted a new policy for clean up promptly after a license is terminated. And what this provides for really is that if a licensee decides to terminate their license and stop doing business in this area, it will be given a specified amount of time by the commission to first prepare a characterization report, which would fully characterize the contamination on the site. And then subsequent to that would be given a specified time to remediate the site, that is to correct it so that it could be released for general public use. So this is our two initiatives that are recent with the commission.

MR. NORELIUS: Have other questions?

LINDELL NORMAN: Yes, sir. My name is Lindell Norman from the DeSoto area. This is directed to Mr. Rode. Is the local hospital educated in what the plan is doing in caring for the people, that is if there was an accident or anything like that, I understood that the man or one of the persons that was involved in the accident a year

or so ago was turned down for treatment at the local hospital?

MR. RODE: There are two sources of treatment that we have. One is the Jefferson Memorial Hospital and the other one for radiation treatment, which is, constitutes, the experts in the St. Louis area is Barnes Hospital. We have arrangements with Barnes Hospital where we would have taken the patients had we felt that it was warranted by the contamination situation. It is unfortunate that we had difficulties in getting that person admitted promptly to the hospital. We have subsequently talked to the people at the hospital. We hope that it will not happen again but we do have the option of transportation to the Barnes complex where they are well set up for handling any kind of radiation problems. And, in fact, they have agreements both with us and with Calloway nuclear plant.

MR. NORELIUS: Any additional questions?

BEVERLY WARDEN: I would like to ask Mr. Rode, any of the new jobs it's going to create? Is there going to be any special consideration given to Hematite residence?

MR. NORELIUS: You stay here.

BEVERLY WARDEN: I'm not applying.

MR. RODE: Well, I should indicate that in general we have endeavored where it's practical to hire people from the immediate area. I'm not sure that we give

people in Hematite preference over people in DeSoto or Festus but we do try and hire from the immediate area. There are a number of reasons for it. One of them is just because they are the people who have the burden of our plant being there and we would like to have them as benefiting from our being in the area. You may not benefit immediately yourself but perhaps your friends or your relatives do. And we like to think of ourselves as a part of the community so we do try first to hire from the area around the plant not just Hematite but generally the area Hillsboro, Festus, DeSoto, Crystal City. It also makes it more attractive to the people in the area because they then have a very short drive to get to our plant. It's convenient for us too because if there were an emergency and we needed to get people into the plant. For instance, in a snow storm, if we were hiring people from St. Louis, it would be very difficult for them to get into the plant if there was bad weather.

MR. NUKUS: Jim, if I'm not out of order what would be your yearly payroll total? If I'm out of order, just forget it.

MR. RODE: I really should know that. I suspect that the number, Len, you may have a better idea on this is something in the neighborhood of four to five million dollars.

JANET BUREN: Who owns the plant?

MR. NORELIUS: Could we get your name, please? My name is Janet Buren, B-U-R-E-N, I'm from Hematite and I just was wondering who owns the plant? I mean, I know there is stockholders but who actually owns the plant? And where are they from?

MR. RODE: The owners of the plant are A.B.B. Combustion Engineering. Combustion Engineering is a U.S. focused company but it is part of Asea, Brown, Boveri. Asea, Brown, Boveri has its corporate offices, the main offices in Zurich, Switzerland. But they, in turn, are owned by two large companies, Asea and Brown, Boveri. Asea is in Sweden. Brown Boveri in Switzerland. But from our standpoint the operating directives come from a president in the United States. What the larger company does primarily is direct strategy for a world wide business unit. The operational instructions are on a national level for the company.

MR. NORELIUS: Any other questions? Okay.

MARTHA DODSON: Martha Dodson, Crystal City, asking once again for local public document room. I have requested that about a dozen times.

MR. NORELIUS: Your request is for a local public document room. Is that what you would like.

MARTHA DODSON: We would like a local public

document room. Washington University is extremely inconvenient, okay.

MR. NORELIUS: Okay. I think we could left us pursue that and we'll see what we can do to change it. There were certain requirements that are beyond our agency as to what type of a library it has to be, certain space and certain arrangements, all of which I'm not familiar with. I just know from another person that it's not quite as simple as one might hope.

MARTHA DODSON: I understand that. Well, I know it's very difficult, it's exceedingly difficult for a local citizen to get any information.

MR. NORELIUS: Let us take your request back and get back to you in terms of what we can do on that.

ROGER HIMES: Roger Himes, Assistant Chief Hematite Fire Protection District. I know there is a disaster plan on paper for this location. Is there is any requirement that that disaster plan be tried out or be rehearsed and, if so, when do they intend to do it?

MR. NORELIUS: There are requirements for the company to periodically meet with local fire and police departments to review their operations. We periodically rehearse and test the response with the company and I believe we did it last about two years ago, as I recall. There is not a requirement for us to do that but we do that

periodically.

ROGER HIMES: There is no requirement for any participation by outside agencies?

MR. NORELIUS: Let me ask, the current plan if that's required, John, the existing plan?

MR. HICKEY: Jim correct me if I'm wrong, but we only require the company, in fuel plants like this we require that the company itself conduct drills and they have to have some communication and training of off site people. But the drills themselves do not have to include the off site personnel and I'm not sure what you all actually do in practice but that is what the requirements are.

MR. RODE: We have attempted on several occasions to work with outside agencies. I think the most recent one that you are referring to that the N.C.R. participated in there was a problem that we had made arrangements before hand with the ambulance district but the ambulance district failed to participate because they had had a real emergency with a school bus accident. We don't necessarily work with every emergency agency on every emergency test. We do attempt to include other agencies but not necessarily every agency depending on the nature of the drill which we are running.

MR. NORELIUS: Let me ask Mr. Rode, do you periodically work with the local police and fire

departments, do you have some affiliation with them in setting up your plans?

MR. RODE: We do. Hal, you would be better equipped to speak to that.

HAROLD ESTRIDGE: I'm Harold Estridge manager of nuclear licensing and safety at the Hematite plant. Recently we prepared a new emergency plan, which was now submitted to the N.C.R. for some comments and approval, hopefully. But this plan we did submit to all of the local off site support agencies for their comments. We sent it to the local ambulance district, both the Jefferson Memorial and Barnes Hospitals, the local fire department, the county emergency district and the state office of emergency preparedness. So we incorporated their comments in the plan and one of the plan's provision is that we do conduct an all full case exercise and invite the off site agencies to participate in this exercise. So in the future we'll be having alot more contact with the off site agencies both providing to us and training and inviting their people to participate in drills and exercises that we have both as observers, which I think we had a fire exercise back late last year that uncovered some additional training we needed to do, which the local fire department was a help in evaluating that exercise. Any other questions?

MR. NORELIUS: Yes.

JANET BUREN: Do you have tours of the plant where the regular people can come in?

HAROLD ESTRIDGE: No. Yes, we do normally if somebody expresses an interest in seeing the plant.

JANET BUREN: Like a group so you don't have to take them one at a time?

MR. RODE: I think I better respond to that one. We do bring people through on tours. The one restriction is the group cannot be too large because we have to suit them out with protective clothing but we can and will happily arrange for people to come through. We have to have a little notice and make arrangements to have the clothing and have people to escort them through but we have taken quite a few people through on plant tours. Would be happy to that more through.

MR. NORELIUS: Anything else? Okay. As I said earlier our purpose tonight was to really try to give you a heads up on what was planned and I think you have heard from the company what they plan to do. We have tried to tell you what we plan to do in terms of licensing and inspection activities. I would repeat again what I said earlier that the N.C.R. will be willing and I know the company has expressed their willingness to have another meeting after this proceeding down the road a bit and prior to operations. So if that is of interest to the local

citizens here, we will be happy to come back and meet with you again.

BEVERLY WARDEN: Is the meeting next Tuesday going to be just about the same as what we had last night?

MR. NORELIUS: I don't know. I believe that's the local planning commission.

MR. RODE: That it a meeting of the county commissioners. This will be with respect to planning and zoning. It's a necessary practice to getting a building permit to begin construction.

BEVERLY WARDEN: Okay. Thanks.

DENNIS WARDEN: I notice you put a new water tour up there on the top of the hill.

MR. NORELIUS: Look at this man, he put it up, I didn't.

DENNIS WARDEN: Is that for your effluent on your water coming--

MR. RODE: Is that for what?

DENNIS WARDEN: Is that strictly for fire?

MR. RODE: The primary purpose of it is dealing with emergencies. There are two reasons, one, really. The secondary reason is for fires. One the major concern that we have is our ammonia tanks, which we have behind the plant and we want to be able to have plenty of water available with adequate pressure for fogging the tank

in case of a leak on the ammonia tanks. But it also provides water for fire fighting purposes, yes, that's the primary reason for it.

DENNIS WARDEN: Does your present effluent discharge that you have say you're discharging to the creek or wherever it's going after you leave the pond, would it be big enough to handle all of that water if you had to use it?

MR. RODE: We would, we will in the future have a much larger sewer line. I'm not sure. We have a gentleman here who was participating in the design. Would you like to speak to that.

JOHN KOSTYSLOCK: My name is John Kostyslock, K-O-S-T-Y-S-L-O-C-K, I'm with Metropolitan Engineering Company. The purpose for the waste water treatment plant that we have and it is a brand new facility, is to treat the sanitary waste that is generated on the site and that is the sole purpose for that. It is has been designed and constructed in accordance with the state requirements. It's also governed by an N.P.D.S. permit, which has been issued by the state, and on March the 23rd the state came out and reviewed that facility and they have approved that facility. The only water, again, that will pass through that treatment plant will be the sanitary waste that is generated from the toilet and things of this natures.

DENNIS WARDEN: That's not what I'm talking

about.

MR. RODE: He's asking about if water, the sewage, sewer system, the storm sewer system don't take the water.

DENNIS WARDEN: Your wash down areas, your discharge on like from a rain comeing off your roof.

JOHN KOSTYSLOCK: That is going through a brand new storm system that is proposed and construction should commence on that around the first of May. There are new requirements again for that even by the E.P.A. to monitor that discharge and the company will be in conpliance with that. In fact, currently they are operating under an N.P.D.S. permit which requires them to monitor that discharge and that has been, they are operating under a permit back in 1989 so they have been under that permit for some three years and probably prior to that. So, again, that is being governed by the state and that sewer system would be able to handle, if they were to have that type of discharge on the site, the sewer system would be able to handle that also.

DENNIS WARDEN: It would be able to handle it and it would not be discharged to the creek, in other words.

MR. KOSTYSLOCK: No, the water generated on that site is contained on the site and passes through the sewer system for monitoring.

MR. NORELIUS: Okay. We have other questions? Okay. I thank you for coming. Good night.

APR 15 1992

NOTICE OF SIGNIFICANT MEETING

Name of Licensee: Combustion Engineering, Inc.

Facility: Hematite Facility
P.O. Box 107
Highway P
Hematite, MO 63047

Docket No. 070-00036

Date and Time: April 21, 1992, 7:00 p.m.

Location: Jefferson College
Arts Center
Little Theater
Hillsboro, Missouri

Purpose: Public Meeting to inform concerned citizens, elected representatives, and Jefferson County officials regarding the planned expansion of Combustion Engineering, Inc. facilities located in Hematite, Missouri.

Attendees:

NRC	CE
J.W.N. Hickey	J.E. Rode
E.M. Keegan	CE staff
C. E. Norelius	
J. A. Grobe	
R. J. Caniano	
G. M. France	

Approved By: Original Signed By:
Michael Tokar, Section Leader
Uranium Fuel Section
Fuel Cycle Safety Branch

Distribution:

NRC File Center	CENorelius
Docket No. 70-36	JAGrobe
PDR	RJCaniano
NMSS R/F	CRobinson
IMSB R/F	EKeegan
MTokar	
JHickey	
SSoong	
VTharpe	
Beveridge/Cornell 1-23	

[SS/NOTICE]

NF15 1

OFC	IMUF	IMUF	IMUF	IMSB			
NAME	SSoong:ll:fb	VTharpe	MTokar	JHickey			
DATE	04/14/92	04/15/92	04/14/92	04/15/92			

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY