

July 1, 2015

MEMORANDUM TO: Anthony Hsia, Deputy Director
Division of Spent Fuel Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Chris Allen, Project Manager */RA/*
Spent Fuel Licensing Branch
Division of Spent Fuel Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF JUNE 16, 2015, MEETING WITH WASTE CONTROL
SPECIALISTS TO DISCUSS ITS APPROACH OF PREPARING THE
ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT AND THE SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT
THAT WILL BE SUBMITTED AS PART OF THE CONSOLIDATED
INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY LICENSE APPLICATION AT THE
WASTE CONTROL SPECIALISTS SITE LOCATED IN ANDREWS
COUNTY, TEXAS (TAC NO. L25012)

Background

On June 16, 2015, a Category 1 public meeting occurred at the Two White Flint Building in Rockville, Maryland between Waste Control Specialists, LLC (WCS) staff and U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff to discuss WCS's approach to preparing the environmental report and the safety analysis report for WCS's Consolidated Interim Storage Facility (CISF) application. Regulatory commitments were not made at the meeting. The list of meeting attendees is in Enclosure 1. The discussion followed the agenda provided in Enclosure 2. WCS provided meeting slides prior to the meeting. The meeting slides can be found using Agencywide Document Accession Management System accession number ML15174A007.

Discussion

After presenting the environmental report information in their slide presentation, WCS answered questions from NRC staff. In its responses, WCS indicated that permits from other government agencies would be needed to operate the CISF, and that they would interact with the Department of Transportation to resolve any transportation issues. WCS clarified that the environmental report submitted with the license application would address environmental affects for 40,000 metric tonnes of fuel even though the license application would only request authorization to store spent fuel associated with "stranded" sites, i.e.; sites without an operating reactor. WCS identified that the license application would request authorization to store fuel for an initial 40 year period, and any subsequent renewal requests would be for 20 years. WCS intends to focus on receiving fuel from "stranded" sites. WCS stated these "stranded" sites possessed less than 5000 metric tonnes of spent fuel. They further explained that they intend to increase the amount of fuel authorized for storage incrementally through license amendments. They also clarified that the rail spur discussed during the presentation would not need upgrading because WCS had recently been able to bring steam generators into their low level waste facility. The ability of stranded sites to ship fuel by rail was also discussed in general terms between WCS and NRC personnel when this issue was raised. When asked if

the environmental impacts at storage sites from which WCS would receive spent fuel would be evaluated, WCS answered that they would not. A question was asked about the acceptability of referencing environmental information, and NRC staff indicated that this approach had been employed before. WCS was queried about seismic criteria used to evaluate the site, but WCS staff did not have that information readily available. When WCS identified their intent to use environmental data associated with licensing their low level waste facility as much as possible, it was asked if this was appropriate. WCS clarified that, for the CISF application, WCS would use data applicable to irradiated nuclear fuel. When asked if health effects associated with their studies were due to radiation, WCS responded that the health effects identified were not tied specifically to radiation. Concerns that the CISF would become a stranded site itself were expressed, but NRC staff responded that topic was beyond the scope of the meeting.

Several callers from Eunice, New Mexico participated in the meeting. One stated the CISF was generally not supported by the local populace, and that the WCS application would be opposed. Another asked why a 4-mile-radius had been employed for the environmental justice information versus a 30 mile radius for other aspects of the environmental report, WCS explained that the 4-mile-radius was based upon an NRC technical memo, and the 30 mile radius had been employed by WCS for previous studies associated with its low level waste facility. Other Eunice, New Mexico residents stated the four mile environmental justice radius should be expanded to five miles in order to include Eunice, New Mexico, and due to frustration over inconsistent local information about the amount of fuel to be stored at the CISF, requested WCS seek authorization to store 40,000 metric tonnes of fuel with their initial application. A member of the general public expressed concerns about the safety of transporting spent fuel, but NRC staff stated a risk assessment report had been issued which identified the risk associated with transporting spent fuel was low.

After listening to the safety analysis report licensing presentation, NRC staff stressed that using transportation certificate dose rate and thermal evaluations to license the CISF would be closely evaluated as would information associated with shipping damaged canisters off-site for repair. NRC staff also stressed that canning of high burnup fuel was not required, and they said that directly incorporating information related to the storage systems used at the CISF may be preferable versus incorporating the information by reference. NRC staff suggested the applicant review Part 72 specific licenses for guidance on information needed for approving storage of greater than Class C waste as well as applicable Interim Staff Guidance as these may also influence the applicant's evaluations. NRC staff asked several questions of AREVA Inc., and NAC International, Inc. as well as WCS. NRC staff inquired if a facility description had been developed. The response identified in general what facilities would be at the site terms, and it was stated that greater detail would follow in future meetings. NRC staff requested clarification about how storage systems would be arranged at the CISF. The response identified that two separate concrete storage pads would be built within one area. One pad would be constructed for the AREVA systems and a second pad would be constructed for the NAC systems. NRC staff suggested organizing the storage systems according to the originating site might also assist with implementing aging management programs (AMPs). When asked questions about the frequency of shipments and the number of canisters per shipment, the applicants provided their best estimates. In addition, a general outline of the receipt inspection steps was given. NRC staff inquired where receipt inspection instructions would be located within the safety analysis report and the information was provided. NRC staff asked if each canister would be inspected as part of the receipt inspection process. The applicant responded they would likely inspect canisters if a transportation incident occurred. NRC staff stated they felt it prudent to inspect the canisters which would be stored at CISF as part of the receipt inspection, and NRC staff also encouraged the applicant to explicitly identify at what point the Part 71 regulations

would end and the Part 72 regulations would commence. When asked who would possess the fuel stored at CISF, NRC staff was informed that the Department of Energy would take possession of the fuel at the originating storage site and would retain possession of the fuel after it reached CISF. Relative to presentation statements about shipping damaged canisters off-site, NRC staff asked what criteria would be used to classify a canister as damaged, failed, etc. As the response pointed to the AMPs, NRC staff reiterated its suggestion to inspect the storage canisters as part of the facility receipt inspection procedures, and also asked how AMPs would be incorporated. The applicant stated its intent to incorporate AMPs as they were issued. NRC staff also noted that AMPs employed at CISF might differ from the AMPs employed at the originating site. NRC staff asked if a recovery plan for handling canisters identified as damaged or failed would be submitted as part of the application, and the applicant responded a recovery plan would not be submitted. NRC staff inquired how NAC canisters would be re-oriented from a horizontal transport position to a vertical storage position as well as the design criteria and inspection procedures to be used for lifting equipment. In addition to reviewing applicable NRC documents, NAC's 10 CFR Part 50 experience at operating reactors was cited. When asked a security related question, the applicant stated that that information would be provided in a future security meeting.

Members of the public also asked several questions. One caller noted that a specific AREVA, Inc. canister type had been omitted, and asked if this had been intentional. The applicant responded it was intentional. When asked how canister aging management would be handled, the applicant pointed to the NRC inspection program. Relative to seismic activity, when asked if additional seismic limitations would be imposed, the response identified that the storage system designs would bound the seismic activity data for the proposed site. A member of the public also inquired if the seismic data provided with the application would either address or incorporate the impact of fracking, and the applicant responded that it would. When a member of the public questioned the safety of canisters presented for transport, NRC staff emphasized that canisters would not be transported unless they were determined to be safe. Another member of the public asked who would be responsible for paying for long term storage at the site, and NRC staff responded that this subject would not be considered in reviewing the license application. When opposition by the New Mexico senators to private businesses taking control of spent nuclear fuel was raised, NRC staff responded such issues are resolved through laws passed by Congress. WCS added that they did not intend to move forward with the application if the Department of Energy would not take possession of the fuel.

Finally, the applicant stated their intention to submit all information required for a license application in 2016, and the NRC staff encouraged the applicant to provide clear and explicit information in the application especially if the applicant decided to reference safety analysis report information for storage systems. The applicant clarified that, if storage system safety analysis reports would be referenced, they planned to reference specific sections of the safety analysis report. NRC staff also indicated that public meetings could be held in the future on draft sections of the safety analysis report.

TAC No. L25012

Enclosures:

1. Meeting Attendees
2. Meeting Agenda

would end and the Part 72 regulations would commence. When asked who would possess the fuel stored at CISF, NRC staff was informed that the Department of Energy would take possession of the fuel at the originating storage site and would retain possession of the fuel after it reached CISF. Relative to presentation statements about shipping damaged canisters off-site, NRC staff asked what criteria would be used to classify a canister as damaged, failed, etc. As the response pointed to the AMPs, NRC staff reiterated its suggestion to inspect the storage canisters as part of the facility receipt inspection procedures, and also asked how AMPs would be incorporated. The applicant stated its intent to incorporate AMPs as they were issued. NRC staff also noted that AMPs employed at CISF might differ from the AMPs employed at the originating site. NRC staff asked if a recovery plan for handling canisters identified as damaged or failed would be submitted as part of the application, and the applicant responded a recovery plan would not be submitted. NRC staff inquired how NAC canisters would be re-oriented from a horizontal transport position to a vertical storage position as well as the design criteria and inspection procedures to be used for lifting equipment. In addition to reviewing applicable NRC documents, NAC's 10 CFR Part 50 experience at operating reactors was cited. When asked a security related question, the applicant stated that that information would be provided in a future security meeting.

Members of the public also asked several questions. One caller noted that a specific AREVA, Inc. canister type had been omitted, and asked if this had been intentional. The applicant responded it was intentional. When asked how canister aging management would be handled, the applicant pointed to the NRC inspection program. Relative to seismic activity, when asked if additional seismic limitations would be imposed, the response identified that the storage system designs would bound the seismic activity data for the proposed site. A member of the public also inquired if the seismic data provided with the application would either address or incorporate the impact of fracking, and the applicant responded that it would. When a member of the public questioned the safety of canisters presented for transport, NRC staff emphasized that canisters would not be transported unless they were determined to be safe. Another member of the public asked who would be responsible for paying for long term storage at the site, and NRC staff responded that this subject would not be considered in reviewing the license application. When opposition by the New Mexico senators to private businesses taking control of spent nuclear fuel was raised, NRC staff responded such issues are resolved through laws passed by Congress. WCS added that they did not intend to move forward with the application if the Department of Energy would not take possession of the fuel.

Finally, the applicant stated their intention to submit all information required for a license application in 2016, and the NRC staff encouraged the applicant to provide clear and explicit information in the application especially if the applicant decided to reference safety analysis report information for storage systems. The applicant clarified that, if storage system safety analysis reports would be referenced, they planned to reference specific sections of the safety analysis report. NRC staff also indicated that public meetings could be held in the future on draft sections of the safety analysis report.

TAC No. L25012

Enclosures:

1. Meeting Attendees
2. Meeting Agenda

Distribution: NRC Attendees DMarcano
 Filename: G:\SFST\Allen\WCS Meeting Summary.docx

ADAMS Accession No.: ML15182A322

OFC:	SFM		SFM		SFM	
NAME:	WAllen		WWheatley		BWhite for MSampson	
DATE:	7/1/15		7/1/15		7/1/15	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

MEETING ATTENDEES

Public Meeting with Waste Control Specialists to discuss its approach of preparing the environmental and safety analysis report for its Consolidated Interim Storage Facility license application at the WCS site in Andrews County, Texas

June 16, 2015

NAME	AFFILIATION	NAME	AFFILIATION	NAME	AFFILIATION
Mark Lombard	NRC	Christina Leggett	NRC	Jack Boshoven	AREVA
Anthony Hsia	NRC	Phillip Brochman	NRC	George Carver	NAC
Aladar Csontos	NRC	Mark Thaggard	NRC	Bruce Bevard	ORNL
Patricia Silva	NRC	Robert Johnson	NRC	Andrew Griffith	DOE
Christian Araguas	NRC	Young Kim	NRC	Mike McMahon	AREVA
John Vera	NRC	Diana Diaz-Toro	NRC	Sam Day-Woodruff	Frederick, Perales, Allmon & Rockwell
John-Chau Nguyen	NRC	Lydia Chang	NRC	Roy King	WCS
Jennifer Davis	NRC	Bob Tripathi	NRC	Renee Murdock	WCS
Chris Allen	NRC	Jimmy Chang	NRC	Miranda Vesely	WCS
Lisa London	NRC	Steve Everard	NRC	Betsy Madru	WCS
Kristina Banovac	NRC	Bernie White	NRC	Melissa Bates	DOE
Jessica Bielecki	NRC	Rod Baltzer	WCS	Josh Jarrell	ORNL
Tim McCartin	NRC	Scott Kirk	WCS	Brian Gutherman	Gutherman Technical Services
Banad Jagannath	NRC	Tim Mathews	Morgan Lewis	Robert Howard	ORNL
Jason Piotter	NRC	Don Silverman	Morgan Lewis	W. Mark Nutt	ANL
David Tang	NRC	Rick Jacobi	Jacobi Consulting	Elaine Hiruo	Platts
Chris Jacobs	NRC	Ashley McLain	Cox/McLain Env. Consulting	Mary Pietrzyk	NEI
Zhian Li	NRC	Mike Callahan	WCS consultant	Everett Redmond	NEI
Damaris Marcano	NRC	Mathew Hiser	NRC	Kimberly Manzione	Holtec

Enclosure

Meeting Agenda

Meeting with Waste Control Specialists, LLC

June 16, 2015

9:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

Room TWFN, 02B03

Purpose: Waste Control Specialists (WCS) to discuss its approach of preparing the environmental report and the safety analysis report that will be submitted as part of the Consolidated Interim Storage Facility license application at the WCS site located in Andrews County, Texas

Agenda:

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------|
| 09:00 A.M. -
09:10 A.M. | Introductions and Opening Remarks | (NRC/WCS) |
| 09:10 A.M. -
10:10 AM | Environmental Report | (WCS) |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• General Approach to Prepare the Environmental Report• Socioeconomic Impacts• Other Impacts to Affected Environment | |
| 10:10 A.M. –
11:40 A.M. | Safety Analysis Report | (WCS) |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• General Licensing Approach• Approach to Consolidated Interim Storage Facility Specific Issues• Overview of SAR Structure | |
| 11:40 A.M. -
11:55 A.M. | Public Questions and Comments | (NRC/WCS) |
| 11:55 A.M. | Closing Remarks | |