8005120264

GENERAL ELECTRIC

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, 175 CURTNER AVE., SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95125

NUCLEAR FUEL AND SERVICES DIVISION

SPENT FUEL SERVICES OPERATION

DMD-433

Docket No. 70-1308
Materials License No. SNM-1265

PDR

April 25, 1980

Office of Nuclear Material Safety & Safeguards
Attn: R.E. Cunningham, Director
Division of Fuel Cycle & Material Safety
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: RENEWAL OF MATERIALS LICENSE SNM-1265

Gentlemen:

The following information concerning the need for continued operation of the General Electric Morris facility, alternatives considered, quality assurance matters, and the decay period for receipt of fuel is furnished in response to a request dated February 28, 1980, from L. Rouse of your staff.

1) Request:

With respect to need for continued operation, please provide the details of your commitments to provide storage space to utilities as a result of contract or warranty obligations. Provide this information for the present fuel stored onsite at the Morris facility, as well as any obligations that may remain outstanding. Summarize the present needs that constitute a necessity for continued operation. Additionally, include in your response those alternatives that General Electric has considered relative to your needs for continued operation of the facility.

Response:

General Electric needs to continue operation of its spent fuel storage facility at Morris in order to store: (1) GE-owned

16181

fuel, (2) utility-owned fuel either presently in storage or scheduled for receipt pursuant to existing contracts, and (3) other utility-owned fuel if necessary to fulfill existing limited commitments to certain utilities in the event of an emergency situation or lack of full core discharge capability at their plant sites.

In addition, the ownership of and responsibility for additional fuel bundles originally supplied by GE to four utilities are in dispute. The resolution of the dispute with three of these utilities has been postponed. GE is in litigation with the fourth utility. It is GE's position that it does not own and has no responsibility for any of this fuel. However, GE cannot predict the outcome of the litigation or of the other disputes.

Continued operation will also have the advantage of providing a storage place which could be used to alleviate temporary, emergency storage needs of utilities, such as Dairyland Power, as requested by the Department of Energy.

Alternatives to the continued operation of the Morris facility considered were: close the facility as it stands; replace the Morris facility by constructing and licensing a new facility; transfer stored fuel to a private or government-owned facility; return stored fuel to the nuclear power plant where it was used; transfer stored fuel to any nuclear power plant that has storage space available; reprocess the stored fuel; or dispose of the stored fuel as waste material.

None of these were feasible alternatives to continued operation of the Morris facility for the following reasons:

- Closing the facility with stored fuel in place is a violation of regulations.
- Replacing the existing facility with a new facility is inconsistent with the current energy and environmental policies of the Federal government.
- There are no other licensed, private away-from-reactor facilities with sufficient capacity to store the spent fuel presently stored at Morris.
- There are no known government facilities for storing the spent fuel presently stored at Morris.
- Returning spent fuel to the source power plants may be impossible due to lack of sufficient storage space or

inadvisable due to storage space congestion and loss of full core reserve. It is also inadvisable because of additional handling and transport of fuel which would be required.

- o Transferring stored fuel to power plants with space available will create future storage problems at those facilities.
- o Reprocessing the stored fuel is contrary to current governmental policies.
- o Disposing of the stored fuel as waste is not possible due to lack of federal facilities.

Of the alternatives considered, continued operation of the Morris facility represents the least environmental impact. Closing the facility with fuel still in storage is not considered a viable alternative because it violates regulations. The stored fuel must be removed or the facility must continue operation. Replacing the facility requires additional land and resource utilization and eventual transportation of the fuel and its associated environmental impact (shown in 10CFR51, Summary Table S-4). Moving the fuel to any other site involves transportation and if moved to power plant sites it may, in addition, necessitate plant shutdown and the consequent loss of electrical power generation. Reprocessing of the fuel requires transportation to a reprocessing facility and the additional environmental impact due to the process (shown in 10CFR51, Table S-3). Discarding the fuel as waste requires transportation, land and resource utilization to construct facilities for such disposal and results in loss of the energy value of the fuel thus disposed. The latter two alternatives cannot be accomplished because federal policy prohibits reprocessing and federal policy for waste disposal has not been implemented.

2) Request:

Relative to quality assurance (QA), the staff has reviewed your QA plan and recommends revisions in two areas, "QA Records" and "Audits". Guidance used for determining adequacy of the QA plan is the criteria specified in ANSI N46.2, "QA Program Requirements for Post Reactor Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities," and proposed revisions to Regulatory Guide 1.33, "QA Program Requirements for Operation at Nuclear Power Plants."

Response:

Changes described in Attachment A to this letter will be introduced in the next revision of *Spent Fuel Services Operation Quality Assurance Plan*, NEDO-20776, planned for completion by December 1980.

3) Request:

In considering your application for the renewal of Materials License No. SNM-1265, the staff is basing its evaluation on the premise that the receipt of any irradiated fuel at the Morris Operation will have decayed [sic] *for a period of not less than one year. Accordingly, we request that General Electric commit to not receiving any irradiated fuel at the Morris Operation that has not decayed for a period of at least one year. If General Electric cannot make such a commitment, indicate why not.*

Response:

General Electric will commit to not receiving any irradiated fuel at the Morris Operation that has not decayed for a period of at least one year, with the following exceptions:

The present license requirement for fuel received at Morris Operation (see NEDO-21326C, Chapter 10, Section 10.2.1.1.a.(4)) specifies that fuel shall be cooled a minimum of 90 days after reactor shutdown and prior to shipping. Most spent fuel shipping casks have a maximum decay heat generation rate limit that requires a minimum of 120 day cooling. These license and certificate of compliance limits are the basis for some of General Electric's contracts. Therefore, it may be necessary to accept fuel shipments made under contracts that include these limits.

Situations may arise at a utility's reactor which would require shipment of fuel to Morris Operation which had had been cooled less than one year.

The NRC shall be notified in advance on a case by case basis when it is necessary to implement either of these exceptions.

We trust that these responses to Mr. Rouse's requests will be satisfactory. Please contact C.C. Herrington (408*925-6385) or

H.A. Rogers (408*925-6496) of this office if further information should be required.

Respectfully submitted,

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

D.M. Dawson, Manager
Licensing & Transportation
408*925-6330 MC 861

DMD:CCH:bn

Attachment

ATTACHMENT "A"

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN REVISIONS

Relative to quality assurance (QA), the staff has reviewed your QA plan and recommends revisions in two areas, "QA Records" and "Audits." Guidance used for determining adequacy of the QA plan is the criteria specified in ANSI N46.2, "QA Program Requirements for Post Reactor Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities," and proposed revisions to Regulatory Guide 1.33, "QA Program Requirements for Operation at Nuclear Power Plants."

The following changes in NEDO-20776, *Spent Fuel Services Operation Quality Assurance Plan* will be introduced in the next revision, planned for completion by December, 1980.

1. For Section 17.0 "QA Records"

   a) A definition of the term "permanent record" will be added to the section titled *Glossary of Terms Used In This Plan*, to be consistent with other areas of the Plan.

2. For Section 18.0 "Audits"

   a) Paragraph 18.2.2(c) - General criteria for the composition of an audit team, and for the qualifications and responsibilities of lead auditors and auditors will be added.

   b) Paragraph 18.2.2(e) - This paragraph will be changed to require an audit response within 30 days after receipt of an audit report. This response will state corrective action(s) to be taken, including a schedule for completion of corrective actions, or other specific response to the audit findings.

   c) Paragraph 18.2.2(h) - This paragraph will be revised to reflect the following:

      (1) Results of actions taken to correct deficiencies that affect safety and occur in facility equipment, structures, components or methods

of operation will be reviewed or reaudited within six months after completion of corrective action.

(2) The conformance of the facility operation to requirements contained in license conditions will be audited at least once within 12 months of the initiation of the license requirements, and every twelve months thereafter.

(3) The performance, training, and qualifications of the facility staff engaged in safety-related activities will be audited at least once every 12 months.

(4) Audits will be performed to ensure that all safety-related functions are covered within a period of 24 months.

NOTICE OF DISTRIBUTION

to

SERVICE LIST - DOCKET NO. 70-1308

In the matter of General Electric's application for renewal of Materials License No. SNM-1265, copies of the documents discussed in the attached letter have been forwarded to the law firm of Mayer, Brown and Platt, 231 South LaSalle, Chicago, IL. 60604, counsel for General Electric Company, for transmittal to the service list as shown below:

Andrew C. Goodhope, Esq., Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
3320 Estelle Terrace
Wheaton, Maryland 20906

Dr. Linda W. Little
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
5000 Hermitage Drive
Raleigh, North Carolina 27612

Dr. Forrest J. Remick
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
305 East Hamilton Avenue
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

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

Bridget Little Rorem
Essex, IL 60935

Susan N. Sekuler, Esq.
George William Wolff, Esq.
Office of the Attorney General
188 West Randolph Street
Suite 2315
Chicago, IL 60601

Marjorie Ulman Rothschild, Esq.
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

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

Docketing and Service Section
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Everett J. Quigley
RR1, Box 378
Kankakee, IL 60901

List 3/28/80 A

16181