Docket No. 70-1201 License No. SNM-1168

B&W Fuel Company Commercial Nuclear Fuel Plant ATTN: Ms. Katherine Lester License & Control Administrator P.O. Box 11646 Lynchburg, VA 24506-1646

Gentlemen:

As part of the renewal action for License No. SNM-1168, we have reviewed the information in your June 21, and August 10, 1989, submittals. We have identified additional areas that need clarification in order to complete the environmental assessment associated with the licerse renewal. Enclosed is a list of questions regarding CNFP's activities. Written responses to the questions are necessary to complete our renewal process. The review schedule calls for the receipt of eight copies of your response by December 30, 1989. I may be reached at (301) 492-0606 if there are any problems in meeting this schedule or if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by

Merri Horn Uranium Fuel Section Fuel Cycle Safety Branch Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, NMSS

Enclosure: As stated

Distribution: w/encl

Docket 70-1201 IMUF R/F NRC FIle Center IMSB R/F PCR VLTharpe NMSS R/F

MHorn GBidinger GTroup, RII Region II

A Lamine	: IMUF	: IMUF	: IMUF 27B	
NAME : MHorn: mlh	:VLThacpe	: DAMcCaughey	:GHBidinger	

DAMcCaughey

:11/4/89 : 11/14/89 :11/14/89 DATE : 11/19/89 OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

8911290309 891114 PDR ADOCK 07001201



ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS COMMERCIAL NUCLEAR FUEL PLANT DOCKET NO. 70-1201

- 1. In the June 21, 1989, response to question 9, CNFP indicated that the CERF operations are moving to the main building. When this move is completed, will the operations discharge through the main stack or a separate stack? If the discharge is through a separate stack, provide the specifications for the stack (i.e., diameter, height, location in comparison to main stack).
- 2. Provide a copy of your current NPDES permit.
- 3. How much mixed waste is currently onsite? How much does CNFP generate on an annual basis? What are CNFP's plans for disposing/storing any mixed waste generated by CNFP?
- 4. In 1988, a time when radioactive particulates were no longer being introduced to the retention tanks, over 280 $\mu\text{C}i$ of uranium was discharged via the liquid effluent. This compares to a 1987 total of about 180 $\mu\text{C}i$ of uranium, the last year in which discharges were made. The total for the first half of 1989 was 150 $\mu\text{C}i$ of uranium. This is not consistent with the statement that all radiological contaminated water is routed to the evaporator. While some accumulation in the collection system from past operations is to be expected, the recent releases are higher than would be expected from residual contamination. Explain.
- 5. The air concentration (Table 11) for the third quarter of 1986 are about a factor of 10 higher than other quarters, there does not appear to be a corresponding increase in gaseous effluents. Provide an explanation for this increase.
- 6. Provide a legible site map (figure 9.1, page 9-7) that is suitable for copying.