



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II  
SAM NUNN ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER  
61 FORSYTH STREET, SW, SUITE 23T85  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8931

July 31, 2007

Mr. Cary Alstadt  
Manager, Columbia Plant  
Westinghouse Electric Company  
Commercial Nuclear Fuel Division  
Drawer R  
Columbia, SC 29250

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT NO. 70-1151/2007-003

Dear Mr. Alstadt:

This refers to the inspection conducted from July 10-13, 2007, at your facility in Columbia, South Carolina. The purpose of the inspection was to observe and evaluate the performance of your emergency response organization during a simulated accident, to determine the adequacy of the response to protect the health and safety of the public, plant workers, and environment. At the conclusion of the inspection on July 13, 2007, the inspectors discussed the findings with you and members of your staff.

As a result of the inspection, the enclosed NRC Forms 591FF, Safety Inspection Report, Parts 1 and 3 are being issued. The enclosed forms indicate that no violations were identified during the inspection of your licensed activities. Please retain the original form for your files.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be made available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (The Public Electronic Reading Room).

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact us.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Jay L. Henson, Chief  
Fuel Facility Inspection Branch 2  
Division of Fuel Facility Inspection

Docket No. 70-1151  
License No. SNM-1107

Enclosure: NRC Form 591FF Parts 1 and 3

cc w/encl: See page 2

c w/encl:

Marc Rosser, Manager  
 Environment, Health and Safety  
 Commercial Nuclear Fuel Division  
 Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
 Drawer R  
 Columbia, SC 29250

Henry J. Porter, Assistant Director  
 Division of Waste Management  
 Bureau of Land and Waste Management  
 Department of Health & Environmental Control  
 2600 Bull Street  
 Columbia, SC 29201

Distribution w/encl:

M. Adams, NMSS  
 B. Reilly, NMSS  
 J. Henson, RII  
 R. Gibson, RII

PUBLICLY AVAILABLE       NON-PUBLICLY AVAILABLE       SENSITIVE       NON-SENSITIVE

ADAMS: X Yes      ACCESSION NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

OFFICE	RII:DFFI	RII:DFFI					
SIGNATURE	/RA/	R. Gibson for					
NAME	R. Gibson	C. Taylor					
DATE	07/27/2007	7/ /2007					
E-MAIL COPY?	YES	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO

**SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION**

1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPECTED: <b>Westinghouse Electric Company</b> <b>Commercial Nuclear Fuel Division</b> <b>Columbia, SC 29250</b>  INSPECTION REPORT(S) : 70-1151/2007-003	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE <b>U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission</b> <b>Region II, Division of Fuel Facilities Inspection</b> <b>61 Forsyth Street, Suite 23T85</b> <b>Atlanta, GA 30303</b>	
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S) : <p style="text-align: center;">70-1151</p>	4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S): <p style="text-align: center;">SNM-1107</p>	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION: <p style="text-align: center;">07/10-13/2007</p>

**LICENSEE:**

The inspection was an examination of the activities conducted under your license as they relate to radiation safety and to compliance with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) rules and regulations and the conditions of your license. The inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspector. The inspection findings are as follows:

- 1. Based on the inspection findings, no violations were identified.
- 2. Previous violation(s) closed.
- 3. The violation(s), specifically described to you by the inspector as non-cited violations, are not being cited because they were self-identified, non-repetitive, and corrective action was or is being taken, and the remaining criteria in the NRC Enforcement Policy, NUREG-1600, to exercise discretion, were satisfied.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non-Cited Violation(s) was/were discussed involving the following requirement(s) and Corrective Action(s):

- 4. During this inspection certain of your activities, as described below and/or attached, were in violation of NRC requirements and are being cited. This form is a NOTICE OF VIOLATION, which may be subject to posting in accordance with 10 CFR 19.11.

(Violations and Corrective Actions)

Licensee's Statement of Corrective Actions for Item 4, above.

I hereby state that, within 30 days, the actions described by me to the inspector will be taken to correct the violations identified. This statement of corrective actions is made in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201 (corrective steps already taken, corrective steps which will be taken, date when full compliance will be achieved). I understand that no further written response to NRC will be required, unless specifically requested.

Title	Printed Name	Signature	Date
LICENSEE'S REPRESENTATIVE			
NRC INSPECTOR	R. Gibson/C. Taylor		7/26/2007

*Docket File Information*  
**SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT  
AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION**

1. LICENSEE <b>Westinghouse Electric Company Commercial Nuclear Fuel Division Columbia, SC 29250</b> REPORT NUMBER(S) 70-1151/2007-003		2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE <b>U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region II, Division of Fuel Facilities Inspection 61 Forsyth Street, Suite 23T85 Atlanta, GA 30303</b>	
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S) 70-1151	4. LICENSE NUMBER(S) SNM-1107	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION 07/10-13/2007	
6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED 88051 (Emergency Preparedness Exercise)			

**SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION**

**PROGRAM SCOPE**

The Westinghouse Facility fabricates low-enriched (less than 5% U-235) uranium fuel into fuel assemblies for use in both pressurized and boiling water reactors. During the inspection period, there were no plant upsets or unusual operational occurrences.

This routine, announced inspection was to evaluate the licensee's response to a simulated emergency involving an accident with a tractor trailer loaded with low level radioactive waste. The licensee's performance to implement the Emergency Plan (EP) and Emergency Plan Implementing Procedures (EPIPs), and interface with the offsite support agencies was reviewed for adequacy in the protection of workers, the plant, the public, and the environment.

**Emergency Preparedness Exercise**

- The inspectors determined that the exercise objectives and scenario adequately and thoroughly exercised major elements of the Emergency Plan. However, the inspectors noted a weakness in that the licensee along with offsite agencies (e.g., Columbia Fire Department and the State of South Carolina DHEC) pre-staged personnel and equipment that were associated with the scenario prior to the exercise.
- The inspectors determined that the Incident Commander (IC) and other responding personnel performed in a manner that would have protected the workers' safety and resulted in timely mitigation of the release of low level radioactive waste. The inspectors observed a weakness where several examples of communications between the IC and field personnel and/or the IC and the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) were hampered due to inadequate radios. Because of the IC's monitoring of heavy radio traffic and conversations with non-participating personnel, responses from the IC were delayed.

In addition, two weaknesses that were identified in the March 29, 2005 exercise, were repeated in this exercise. The weaknesses were: 1) The effective formation of a unified joint command post between the licensee and the offsite agencies, and 2) The IC didn't adequately establish a hot, warm and/or a cold zone in the vicinity of the incident.

- The general emergency response by EOC management and staff was successful in appropriately addressing the declared Emergency Action Level. Emergency conditions were properly evaluated and protective actions appropriately recommended by the EOC. Emergency classification and external notifications were performed according to procedural requirements. Although not required in the licensee's emergency procedures, the inspectors noted a weakness in that the licensee did not promptly issue a press release concerning the postulated event in a timely manner. Approximately two hours elapsed between the onset of the event and issuance of a press release discussing the event.