ROUTE 2, BOX 44 WALDORF, MARYLAND 20601 Day: (301) 454-4906 Home: (301) 372-8766

0:

February 18, 1980

Daniel R. Muller
Acting Director
Division of Site Safety and Environmental
Analysis
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Dr. Muller:

This will set forth in writing the short comments I made at the Baltimore meeting on the TMI Environmental Impact Statement outline on February 15, 1980.

I expressed my opinion that such a <u>Statement</u> presents the framework for and the justification of important decisions for the necessary clean-up at TMI Unit 2, with a considered minimum effect on the environment. Since a work plan will be the final output of this effort, it is important for the <u>Statement</u> to examine the various parameters of that effort.

Upon examination of the outline dated January 10, 1980 enclosed with the February 1, 1980 letter, I am concerned that there was not appear to be sufficient examination of the following important factors:

Responsibility and Authority - of NRC, of the utility

Limits of Responsibility and Authority - Under conforming (regular) efforts.
Under emergency (unpredicted) efforts.

Methods of Measurement and monitoring of those measurements (of all site effluents moving off-site)

Job control, Supervision, back-up

Specification of training and skills of key people, of other technical people

Identification of key people and incumbents (for both NRC & Utility)

I would be most happy to discuss this further with your. I am after a Statement which has some predictable enablement, not simply one which chooses among alternatives for specific reasons.

Very truly yours,

Harry Kriemelmeyer

8008110 55

HK:sg

cc: Dr. S. Long

0

SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 THE SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS STATEMENT
- 1.2 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANT AND ITS HISTORY, THE MARCH 1979 INCIDENT, EVENTS SINCE THEN AND THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE PLANT
- 1.3 SUMMARY OF THE LICENSEE'S OBJECTIVES, PROPOSED ACTIONS, AND SCHEDULE
- 1.4 ISSUES IN CONTROVERSY RELATIVE TO THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

2. DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE MAJOR ALTERNATIVES

- 2.1 NO ACTION.
- 2.2 PARTIAL DECONTAMINATION TO THE LEVELS AT WHICH SOME TYPES OF DECOM-MISSIONING CAN BE UNDERTAKEN (MOTHBALLING, ETC.)
- 2.3 DECONTAMINATION TO A LEVEL WHICH WOULD PERMIT EITHER RECONSTRUCTION OR DECOMMISSIONING
- 2.4 SHORT-TERM STORAGE OF SOLID WASTES ON SITE AND LATER SHIPMENT TO REPOSITORIES
- 2.5 LONG-TERM STORAGE OF SOLID WASTES ON SITE

3. THE POPULATION AND ENVIRONMENT WHICH MAY BE AFFECTED

- 3.1 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE (WITH ILLUSTRATIONS)
- 3.2 DEMOGRAPHY, LAND USE, AND OTHER SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS
- 3.3 WATER USE AND HYDROLOGY
- 3.4 GEOLOGY (IF NECESSARY)
- 3.5 METEOROLOGY
- 3.6 ECOLOGY

Measurements, Monitoring, sackup Supervision, sackup Contral

4. POST-ACCIDENT ACTIVITIES COMPLETED OR IN PROGRESS

- 4.1 MAINTENANCE OF THE REACTOR IN SAFE CONDITION
 - 4.1.1 OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS
 - 4.1.2 MONITORING OF REACTOR AND CONTAINMENT INTEGRITY
 - 4.1.3 DECAY HEAT REMOVAL
 - 4.1.4 EFFLUENTS AND RELEASES 10 THE ENVIRONMENT
 - 4.1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
 - 4.1.5.1 POSTULATED ACCIDENTS AND EFFECTS
 - 4.1.5.2 OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE AND HEALTH EFFECTS
 - 4.1.5.3 OFF-SITE EXPOSURE AND HEALTH EFFECTS
 - 4.1.5.4 NONRADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS
- 4.2 DECONTAMINATION OF THE AUXILIARY AND FUEL HANDLING BUILDINGS
 - 4.2.1 DESCRIPTION OF EFFORTS TO DATE AND STATUS OF THOSE TO BE COMPLETED
 - 4.2.2 .METHODS USED AND REASONS FOR THEIR SELECTION IF ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED.
 - 4.2.3 ASSOCIATED PROCESSING/HANDLING FACILITIES CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED (IF ANY)
 - 4.2.4 EFFLUENTS AND RELEASES TO THE ENVIRONMENT
 - 4.2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
 - 4.2.5.1 POSTULATED ACCIDENTS AND EFFECTS
 - 4.2.5.2 OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE AND HEALTH EFFECTS
 - 4.2.5.3 OFF-SITE EXPOSURE AND HEALTH EFFECTS
 - 4.2.5.4 NONRADIOLOGICAL EFFECTS
- 4.3 CLEANUP AND DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE WATER IN THE AUXILIARY BUILDING
 - 4.3.1 DESCRIPTION OF EFFORTS TO DATE AND STATUS OF THOSE TO BE COMPLETED
 - 4.3.2 METHODS USED AND REASONS FOR THEIR SELECTION IF ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED