



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION III  
799 ROOSEVELT ROAD  
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS 60137

PDR

057 8 1980

Docket 50-254

Commonwealth Edison Company  
ATTN: Mr. Cordell Reed  
Vice President  
Post Office Box 767  
Chicago, IL 60690

Gentlemen:

This is in reply to your letter of May 9, 1980, concerning the transportation noncompliance discussed in our letters of February 22 and April 21, 1980. We referred your May 9 letter and related correspondence to our Headquarters for review. We have been advised as a result of that review that the noncompliance was correctly stated in our letters.

Your May 9 contention that the shipping cask could be considered a freight container is incorrect, because the cask was used for shielding. Had the cask been used as a personnel barrier or to simulate a closed vehicle, it could have been considered a freight container subject to placarding rather than marking.

Inasmuch as this letter confirms the validity of the noncompliance citation, we expect you to provide the following, as requested in our February 22 and April 21, 1980, letters: (1) corrective action taken and the results achieved; (2) corrective action to be taken to avoid further noncompliance; and (3) the date when full compliance will be achieved.

Sincerely,

*W. L. Fisher*  
for A. B. Davis, Chief  
Fuel Facility and Materials  
Safety Branch

cc w/encl:  
Mr. J. S. Abel, Director  
of Nuclear Licensing  
Mr. N. Kalivianakis,  
Plant Superintendent  
Central Files  
Reproduction Unit NRC 20b  
AEOD  
Resident Inspector, RIII  
PDR  
NSIC  
Mr. Dean Hansell, Office of  
Assistant Attorney General

8011040646

Q



Commonwealth Edison  
One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois  
Address Reply to Post Office Box 767  
Chicago, Illinois 60690

POOR ORIGINAL

May 9, 1980

Mr. James G. Keppler, Director  
Directorate of Inspection and  
Enforcement - Region III  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
799 Roosevelt Road  
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Subject: Quad Cities Station Unit 1  
Additional Response to IE  
Inspection Report No. 15000039/79-08E  
NRC Docket Nos. 50-254

References (a): A. B. Davis letter to C. Reed dated April 21,  
1980

(b): D. L. Peoples letter to J. G. Keppler dated  
March 18, 1980

Dear Mr. Keppler:

Reference (a) provided a reply to our response to the subject inspection report (Reference (b)). This reply stated your disagreement with our interpretation of the regulations and our position that a noncompliance did not occur. Reference (a) cited Regulations 49 CFR 173.392 (c)(8), 49 CFR 171.8, and 49 CFR 173.393 (j)(3) and (4) to identify sections where noncompliance existed.

The above regulation wording apparently allows different interpretations. Our review of these regulations continues to support our conclusion that the radioactive waste shipment identified in the subject inspection report was in full compliance with the regulations. Our basis for this is as follows:

1. 49 CFR 171.8 defines "Package" or "Outside Package" as packaging plus its contents. "Packaging" is defined as "the assembly of one or more containers and any other components necessary to assure compliance with the minimum packaging requirements of this subchapter..." (emphasis added). This definition also excludes freight containers from the definition of "packaging". Note that "packaging" is defined as one or more

Dupe

8005140520

MAY 12 1980

POOR ORIGINAL

Mr. James G. Keppler, Director  
 May 9, 1980  
 Page 2

containers not one or more packages. The drums which were shipped are approved Type A packages, and in themselves met all applicable packaging requirements as stated in the definition of packaging, as will be shown below.

2. 49 CFR 173.393 (j)(1) through (4) specify radiation limits for shipment. The only packaging requirement is part (j)(1). The individual Type A packages, the drums themselves, met this requirement. The radiation limits set forth in parts (j)(2) through (4) are vehicle requirements. The shielded cask is used to meet the vehicle requirements only, and is not necessary to meet the minimum packaging requirements. Therefore, applying the definition of "package" in 49 CFR 171.8, the cask must be defined as part of the vehicle (or a freight container) and not a package.
3. 49 CFR 173.392 (c)(8) requires the outside of each outside package to be marked "Radioactive-LSA". Since the drums are the packages and not the cask (see 2 above) this requirement was satisfied.
4. The shipping cask is more properly classified as a freight container. 49 CFR 171.8 defines a "freight container" as "a reusable container having a volume of 64 cubic feet or more designed and constructed to permit being lifted with its contents intact and intended primarily for containment of packages (in unit form) during transportation". As stated in 1. above, a freight container is specifically excluded from the definition of "packaging". Since it is not a package, it need not be marked per 49 CFR 173.392(c)(8).

Based on the above discussion, we believe that the radioactive waste shipment identified in the subject inspection report did meet all applicable requirements of 49 CFR Part 170-189, as required by 10 CFR 71.5, and that there were no items of noncompliance.

Please address any additional questions you may have concerning this matter to this office.

Very truly yours,

*D. L. Peoples*  
 D. L. Peoples  
 Director of  
 Nuclear Licensing