



NRC PUBLIC DOCUMENT ROOM

May 14, 1979

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)	
)	
VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY)	Docket Nos. 50-338SP
)	50-339SP
(North Anna Nuclear Power Station)	Proposed Amendment to
Units 1 and 2))	Operating License
)	NPF-4

VEPCO'S ANSWER TO NOTICE OF HEARING

1. The atomic safety and licensing board designated for this proceeding (the Board) has issued a Notice of Hearing dated May 4, 1979. The applicant, Virginia Electric and Power Company (Vepco), makes this answer to that Notice pursuant to the Commission's regulation 10 CFR § 2.705.

2. The nature of Vepco's position. Vepco's position is that the proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-4, which would permit an increase in the fuel storage capacity of the North Anna 1 and 2 spent fuel storage pool from 400 to 966 fuel assemblies, should be issued. Vepco contends that installation and use of the high-density spent fuel storage racks at issue in this proceeding will be in conformity with the license amendment application, as amended, the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the rules and regulations of the Commission; that there is reasonable assurance that the in-

515 343

7907130082

stallation and use of the high-density racks can be done without endangering the health and safety of the public and in compliance with the regulations in 10 CFR Part 50; and that the issuance of the license amendment will not be inimical to the health and safety of the public. Vepco further contends that the installation and use of the high-density spent fuel storage racks will have an insignificant effect on the quality of the human environment and that the issuance of the proposed amendment is not a "major Commission action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." In short, Vepco contends that the issuance of the proposed amendment will be in full compliance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Commission's rules and regulations, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

3. Specification of issues. The contentions at issue in this proceeding were set out in the Board's "Order Granting Intervention, Providing for a Hearing and Designating Contentions of Intervenor," dated April 21, 1979. The items in those contentions that Vepco controverts and those that it does not controvert are the following:

a. Thermal Effects (CEF). Vepco denies that the possible consequences caused by the additional heat to be discharged as a result of the proposed modifications have not been adequately addressed by the NRC Staff and the Applicant. Vepco asserts that the possibility of an accidental leak in the spent fuel pool is extremely small and that, even were such a leak to occur, the consequences,

including the rate of temperature rise (if any) in the spent fuel storage facility, would not be inimical to the public health and safety. Vepco denies that the spent fuel pool cooling system will be inadequate to prevent "hot spots" and possible boiling.

b. Radioactive Emission (CEF). Vepco denies that it has neglected to address the additional liquid and gaseous radioactive emissions which will result from the increased fuel storage and the effects thereof. Vepco denies that its analyses of radiation released, and of possible releases, in the event of those accidents considered in Sections 9.1-9.4 of the application are superficial and insubstantial in the Summary of the Proposed Modifications. Vepco denies that it has failed to analyze adequately the liquid and gaseous radioactive emissions that will result from the proposed increase in fuel storage capacity, and Vepco denies that it has failed to demonstrate that significant adverse environmental effects will not result from such emissions.

c. Missile Accidents (Potomac Alliance). Vepco denies that the proposed modification of the spent fuel pool will materially increase the consequences of an accident involving missiles, and Vepco contends that it has demonstrated that the pool, as modified, will withstand such accidents within the limits set forth in NRC Regulations.

d. Materials Integrity (Potomac Alliance). Vepco

denies that increasing the inventory of radioactive materials in the spent fuel pool will materially increase the corrosion of, the stress upon, and resultant problems concerning the components and contents of the pool. Vepco contends that it has adequately addressed such potential problems with respect to (1) the fuel cladding, as a result of exposure to decay heat and increased radiation levels during extended periods of pool storage, and (2) the racks and pool liner, as a result of exposure to higher levels of radiation during pool storage.

e. Corrosion (CEF). Vepco denies that there has been inadequate examination of the problems that may arise due to a potential incremental increase in the amount of corrosion on the spent fuel assemblies and racks over the duration of storage of fuel in the pool, including their eventual removal from the pool. Vepco contends that the spent fuel pool purification system will be fully capable of removing any potential incremental impurities. Vepco further contends that a potential incremental increase in the amount of corrosion upon the spent fuel assemblies will not give rise to any problems that cannot be adequately dealt with by existing plant systems or to any conditions that will be inimical to the public health and safety.

f. Occupational Exposure (Potomac Alliance).

Vepco contends that it has demonstrated that it will prevent any increased occupational radiation levels that may result from the spent fuel pool modification from leading to occupational doses in excess of those permitted under NRC Regulations. Vepco contends that occupational exposure is not an admissible contention in this proceeding but requests that the Board make findings on it all the same so as to create an adequate record for review.

g. Alternatives (Potomac Alliance) Vepco denies the Potomac Alliance's contention that neither Vepco nor the NRC Staff has adequately considered alternatives to the proposed action. Vepco contends that the alternatives to the proposed action are inferior to the proposed action, including the following alternatives: (1) the construction of a new spent fuel pool onsite, (2) the physical expansion of the existing spent fuel pool, and (3) the use of the spent fuel pool at North Anna Units 3 and 4 (including the completion of construction of such pool, if necessary) for storage of spent fuel from Units 1 and 2.

4. Participation in Hearing. Vepco proposes to appear at the public hearing and present evidence, if a public hearing is held.

5. Vepco believes, however, that no public hearing will be necessary in this proceeding, because all of the contentions are subject to summary disposition under the Commission's regulation 10 CFR § 2.749. Vepco filed a motion for summary disposi-

tion on May 11, 1979, and will supplement that motion, with the Board's permission, if it becomes necessary to do so.

6. The Board's Order of May 4 says that the Board is amenable to a motion to reschedule the hearing at a later date for good cause shown. Vepco appreciates the Board's efforts to accommodate the wishes of the parties in this manner. At this time, however, Vepco is opposed to any delay in the hearing schedule.

Respectfully submitted,

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER
COMPANY

/s/ James N. Christman
James N. Christman

Of Counsel

Michael W. Maupin
James N. Christman
James M. Rinaca

Hunton & Williams
P.O. Box 1535
Richmond, VA 23212

DATED: May 14, 1979

515 348

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served a copy of Vepco's Answer to Notice of Hearing on each of the persons named below by first-class mail, postage prepaid.

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attention: Chief, Docketing & Service Section

Valentine B. Deale, Esquire
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Quentin J. Stober
Fisheries Research Institute
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Mr. Ernest E. Hill
Lawrence Livermore Laboratory
University of California
Livermore, California 94550

Mr. Irwin B. Kroot
Citizens' Energy Forum, Inc.
P.O. Box 138
McLean, Virginia 22101

James B. Dougherty, Esquire
307 Eleventh Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Gloria M. Gilman, Esquire
1508 28th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Steven C. Goldberg, Esquire
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Anthony J. Gambardella, Esquire
Office of the Attorney General
Suite 308
11 South Twelfth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

By /s/ James N. Christman
James N. Christman
Counsel for Virginia Electric
and Power Company

DATED: May 14, 1979