

MAY 23 1991

Docket No. 50-271

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation
ATTN: Mr. Warren P. Murphy
Senior Vice President, Operations
RD 5, Box 169
Ferry Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Subject: Inspection No. 50-271/90-13

This refers to your letter dated January 4, 1991, in response to our letter dated December 5, 1990.

We have reviewed your response to the Notice of Violation transmitted to you in our letter of December 5, 1990, in reference to Inspection 50-271/90-13. While we acknowledge your concerns on this matter, based upon our review, and discussions with NRC Headquarters personnel, the violation stands as issued.

You take exception to the violation because of the lack of previous official NRC guidance on what detection limits are to be applied in this situation. You also cite a conversation with an NRC staff member concerning the limitation of the guidance on sewer sludge. Additionally, you state that because of the lack of official NRC guidance you established a program that you believed was proper, consistent with industry practice, and adequately determined the presence or absence of licensed material released from controlled areas of the plant. You determined that the level of detection used to clear oil from the controlled area of the plant was reasonable to determine that there was no significant radiation hazard to the public.

We disagree with your perspective on the violation. Our issue is whether any licensed material could have been released from your facility in an unauthorized manner, rather than whether what was released would create a significant hazard to the public. The regulations of 10 CFR 20 (10 CFR 20.301) limit the manner in which licensed material may be disposed, and require appropriate surveys/evaluations to ensure compliance. You did not perform the required evaluation (per 10 CFR 20.201(b)) for the burning of waste oil taken from controlled areas of the plant to ensure no licensed material was involved. While the program you established may have been adequate for releasing the oil from the controlled areas of the plant, it was not adequate to demonstrate that licensed material was not released (disposed of) from your facility in an unauthorized manner.

We agree that no formalized guidance has been distributed on this specific situation; however, the same LLD levels were referenced in guidance given to you concerning the disposal of sewage sludge from your site. We also note that

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

RL VY 90-13 - 0001.0.0
05/21/91

COM
9106070302 910523
PDR ADOCK 05000271
G PDR

IE 06

MAY 23 1991

the NRC recently cited another licensee for burning oil under similar circumstances (Grand Gulf, NRC Inspection Report No. 50-146/90-05), and that also provided the same criteria.

With respect to your discussion with Mr. Meinke of the NRC on May 10, 1989, we regret that these discussions apparently were undocumented by you or Mr. Meinke, who subsequently left the NRC. We have discussed this issue with his management; they are also unaware of the details of the conversation, or the bases for any statements that may have been made. We are sorry if those discussions misled you, but it is the NRC view that the position stated in the preceding paragraphs is appropriate. Because sufficient bases for withdrawing the violation have not been provided, we conclude that the violation stands as cited.

Finally, we note that the actions you have taken subsequent to the inspection, as detailed in your reply, appear appropriate and adequate. No further response to the letter is required.

Regarding Unresolved Item 50-271/90-13-02, we have responded to that item in our letter to you dated March 26, 1991.

Your cooperation with us is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By
MALCOLM R. KNAPP

Malcolm R. Knapp, Director
Division of Radiation Safety and
Safeguards

cc:

J. Weigand, President and Chief Executive Officer
J. Pelletier, Vice President, Engineering
D. Reid, Plant Manager
J. DeVincentis, Vice President, Yankee Atomic Electric Company
L. Tremblay, Senior Licensing Engineer, Yankee Atomic Electric Company
J. Gilroy, Director, Vermont Public Interest Research Group, Inc.
G. Iverson, New Hampshire Office of Emergency Management
Vermont Yankee Hearing Service List
Publ' Document Room (PDR)
Nuclear Safety Information Center (NSIC)
Local Public Document Room (LPDR)
Nuclear Safety Information Center (NSIC)
K. Abraham, PAO
NRC Resident Inspector
State of New Hampshire, SLO Designee
State of Vermont, SLO Designee
Commonwealth of Massachusetts, SLO Designee

MAY 23 1991

bcc:

- J. Joyner, DRSS
- J. Johnson, DRP
- J. Rogge, DRP
- H. Eichenholz, SRI - Vermont Yankee
- T. Koshy, SRI - Vermont Yankee
- K. Brockman, EDO
- M. Fairtile, NRR
- Region I Docket Room (w/concurrences)
- Management Assistant, DRMA (w/o encl)

RI:DRSS
S. Kelly
 O'Connell/mlb/slj
 2/13/91

RI:DRSS
SSM
 Noggle
 2/13/91

RI:DRSS
W
 Pasciak
 2/20/91

RI:DRSS
S. Bore
 Bores
 2/17/91
 4/29/91

RI:DRSS
J. Joyner
 Joyner
 2/22/91
 5/10/91

RI:DRSS
M
 Knapp
 2/22/91
 5

VERMONT YANKEE HEARING SERVICE LIST

Diane Curran, Esq.
Harmon, Curran & Tousley
2001 S Street, N.W., Suite 430
Washington, D.C. 20009

John Traficonte, Esq.
Chief Safety Unit
Office of the Attorney General
One Ashburton Place, 19th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Geoffrey M. Huntington, Esq.
Office of the Attorney General
Environmental Protection Bureau
State House Annex
25 Capitol Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301-6397

Charles Bechhoefer, Esq.
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Gustave A. Linenberger, Jr.
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Vermont Public Interest Research
Group, Inc.
43 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Raymond N. McCandless
Vermont Division of Occupational
and Radiological Health
Administration Building
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

R. K. Gad, III
Ropes & Gray
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Mr. J. Gary Weigand
President & Chief Executive Officer
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.
RD 5, Box 169
Ferry Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

Public Service Board
State of Vermont
120 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05620

James Volz, Esq.
Special Assistant Attorney General
Vermont Department of Public Service
120 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05620

G. Dana Bisbee, Esq.
Office of the Attorney General
Environmental Protection Bureau
State House Annex
25 Capitol Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301-6397

Adjudicatory File (2)
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel Docket
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. James H. Carpenter
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Chairman, Board of Selectmen
Town of Vernon
P.O. Box 116
Vernon, Vermont 05354-0116

Attorney General
State of Vermont
109 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Robert M. Lazo, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. James P. Pelletier
Vice President - Engineering
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.
P.O. Box 169
Ferry Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

VERMONT YANKEE HEARING SERVICE LIST

Mr. John DeVincentis, Vice President
Yankee Atomic Electric Company
580 Main Street
Bolton, Massachusetts 01740-1398

Jerry Harbour
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. W. P. Murphy
Senior Vice President, Operations
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.
RD 5, Box 169
Ferry Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

Jerry R. Kline
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555


Ms. V. Louise McCarren
Vermont Department of Public Service
120 State Street, 3rd Floor
Montpelier, Vermont 05620

Resident Inspector
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 176
Vernon, Vermont 05354

Frederick J. John
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION



Ferry Road, Brattleboro, VT 05301-7002

BVY 91-001

ENGINEERING OFFICE

140 MAIN STREET
BOLTON, MA 01507
617-725-6711

January 4, 1991

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

Attn: Document Control Desk

References: a) License No. DPR-28 (Docket No. 50-271)
b) Letter, USNRC to VYNPC, Inspection Report 90-13, dated 12/5/90

Dear Sir:

Subject: Response to Inspection Report 90-13, Notice of Violation

During a routine unannounced radiological controls inspection conducted on October 1-5, 1990, a violation of NRC requirements and an unresolved item were identified. Our response to these items is provided below.

VIOLATION

10 CFR 20.201(b) specifies that each licensee shall make or cause to be made such surveys as 1) may be necessary for the licensee to comply with the regulations in this part, and 2) are reasonable under the circumstances to evaluate the extent of radiation hazards that may be present.

10 CFR 20.301 specifies, in part, that no licensee shall dispose of licensed material except:

- a) by transfer to an authorized recipient as provided in the regulations; or
- b) as authorized pursuant to 20.302 or Part 61 of this chapter; or
- c) as provided in 20.303, 20.306 or 20.106.

Contrary to the above, on several occasions, including from February 1990 until October 1990, the licensee burned waste oil taken from controlled areas of the facility without adequately surveying the material. Specifically, the licensee did not establish a lower limit of detection (LLD) comparable with the Technical Specification Environmental LLD.

This is a Severity Level IV Violation (Supplement IV).

~~9101140383~~

RESPONSE

Concerning the Severity Level IV Violation imposed as a result of burning "...waste oil taken from controlled areas of the plant without adequately surveying the material to ensure that it did not contain licensed material...", we respond, and take exception to this violation, as follows:

The regulations governing the disposal of licensed material are correctly stated in the violation however, there has been no previous official guidance from the NRC on what detection methods or limits of detection are to be used in this situation. Because of the lack of official guidance, Vermont Yankee established a program that it believed was proper, consistent with industry practice and adequately determined the presence or absence of licensed materials released from the controlled areas of the facility. This program has been in effect for years without previous NRC comment. This general release program was applied to the release of waste oil for burning when that process began in February 1990. We concluded that the level of detection used to clear oils from the controlled areas of the plant was reasonable under the circumstances to determine that there was no significant radiation hazard to the public because it was able to detect:

1. The 10CFR20 Appendix B, Table II, Column 2 levels for the most significant isotopes at the plant. These levels are designed to control exposure due to ingestion of drinking water. The oil is not released to the drinking water pathway.
2. Below the levels of 10CFR30.70, Exempt Concentrations for the most significant isotopes at the plant.
3. Below the levels exempted from the Vermont State Department of Health regulations.

It is not meant to imply that the above regulations are directly applicable to this situation, but they do provide guidance for an acceptable concentration of radioactive material to be released to the general public without a significant radiation hazard.

Additional guidance was provided in 1988 when the NRC issued Information Notice 88-22 concerning the limits of detection to be used for "Disposal of Sludge From Onsite Sewage Treatment Facilities". This notice was very specific to sewage sludge, but in an undocumented telecon with Mr. Wayne Meinke, of the NRC, on 5/10/89, Mr. Bob Leach, of our organization, questioned the application of this guidance to the release of hazardous materials. Mr. Leach was told that hazardous material was a separate issue and that it was not intended that we change our method of clearing those items from the controlled area.

Vermont Yankee exercised reasonable judgement and made a conscientious effort to determine that the oil in question did not contain licensed material that would cause a significant radiation hazard to the public.

Further, when the NRC informed Vermont Yankee, during the inspection, that a recent internal NRC memo had established monitoring LLD's, and that our monitoring program was not in compliance with that memo, the following actions were taken:

1. We immediately stopped burning waste oil released from the radiation control area of the plant and removed all of that oil from the burner storage tank.

2. We immediately halted the release of all liquids from the Radiation Control Area which could be contaminated with licensed material and are not otherwise addressed by the NRC. These liquids are being stored in the Radiation Control Area until the actions outlined in item 3 below are implemented.
3. We are, at this time, revising OP 2610, "Liquid Waste Disposal" to include methods for analyzing liquids proposed for release from the Radiation Control Area down to environmental lower limits of detection as described in Vermont Yankee Technical Specifications Table 4.9.3. Further, liquids found to contain licensed material in excess of the lower limits of detection listed in Table 4.9.3 will be treated as radioactive waste.

While we have taken steps to support the more conservative interpretation, we continue to believe that no regulation exists requiring specific monitoring levels, and consequently that a violation is inappropriate. We trust that you will review the above information, and will subsequently determine that this item does not warrant a violation, because of the lack of previous guidance and our immediate action to clarify and revise our practices once we were notified of your concern.

Unresolved Item
90-13-02

Upon review of the methodology used by the licensee in estimating the individual's intake, it was concluded that the licensee's bioassay program has weaknesses. Weaknesses in methodology that were identified consist of the following:

- A. The licensee assumed that the deposition was due to an inhalation incident, not an ingestion incident, of radioactive material. The licensee also assumed that the intake occurred immediately prior to the whole body count. The licensee's evaluation concluded that the second assumption was conservative. However, this assumption is not conservative for inhalation incidents. Had the intake actually occurred several days prior to the whole body count, the intake estimate would be significantly lower.
- B. The licensee evaluated the intake using a worker breathing rate of 1.0×10^8 cc/working day. This value is not consistent with current internal dosimetry methodology or with 10 CFR 20.103(a)(1) which specifies a total volume of air breathed in 520 hours at 6.3×10^8 cc or 9.7×10^6 cc/working day. Based on this correction, the licensee's evaluation of the intake was low by about a factor of ten.
- C. The licensee's evaluation was based on the assumption that 63% of the intake was retained in the respiratory tract.

Although the percent deposition that was assumed is consistent with current internal dosimetry methodology for lung deposition, actual WBC data indicated no detectable lung deposition as the activity was

located in the GI tract. The licensee did not explain this anomaly. The percent of an intake present in the GI tract immediately after an inhalation intake is actually much smaller than 63%. Appropriate retention factors should have been evaluated in consideration of the WBC results and the activities of the individual.

- D. The licensee has no proceduralized program for performing intake estimates in order to demonstrate compliance with 10 CFR 20.103(a)(3).

RESPONSE

For any positive bioassay occurrence, we compile and review data from air samples, contamination reports, incident reports and logbook entries along with the bioassay results. Screening analysis for intake and dose, using information in NUREG 4884, are normally done on-site for less significant intake events. Use of the YAEC Environmental Laboratory, and their capability of running the computer code INDOS, offers us the capability of independent evaluation and documentation of significant intake events.

After again reviewing the data associated with this event, we have found that our initial estimate is still valid. We also have asked the YAEC Environmental Laboratory to formally document the intake via the computer code INDOS. This documentation supports our initial estimate of the significance of the intake event.

- A) While we believe this event was probably an ingestion event, for analysis, we assumed the intake event occurred via the inhalation pathway. All other assumptions being the same, an inhalation event will give a higher dose and intake than a direct ingestion, supporting our conclusion that the analysis performed was conservative. However, the contention that our process was not conservative rests on the question of when the intake occurred.

If it is assumed that the intake occurred greater than 1 day prior to the assay, the process used would not be conservative. However, because several body counts were taken over the period of 3 days, and the latter body counts showed no activity, the metabolic models applicable to intakes via inhalation indicate a recent intake.

Metabolically, the GI tract is characterized initially by rapid clearance of inhaled activity over the first couple of days, followed by a gradual decrease over periods of time after the intake that are much greater than 1-2 days. The actual clearance that was observed in the individual's repetitive bioassay results can only be described by the inhalation model if the intake occurred no more than 1-2 days before the body counts.

Bioassay measurements showed up to 24 nCi of Co-60 activity in the GI tract, but no activity was measured in the lungs. Body count times greater than 2 days after an intake of 1 micron particles that yield a 24 nCi activity burden in the GI tract would also result in a lung burden, at the time of the body count, of approximately 200 nCi (18% MPOB, lung) which would have been detectable by the body counter. If inhalation of 10 micron particulate matter is assumed, the resultant lung burden would be about 1100 nCi at the time of the body count (85% MPOB, lung). It should be noted that our bioassay measurement techniques are capable of measuring activity burdens on the order of 1 nCi and that we saw nothing in the lung.


Thus, without any activity being measured in the lung, it is not reasonable to assume that an inhalation occurred more than 1-2 days prior to the initial measurements.

- B) Radiation Protection Department personnel evaluate workers' intakes utilizing the results obtained from bioassay measurements, information in NUREG 4884, and reference man data from ICRP 23 and ICRP 30. The information referred to in item 4.4.B of the inspection report, was provided to the inspector in conjunction with air sample data, in an effort to explain our opinion, that it was virtually impossible for the air concentrations on the turbine deck to result in any significant inhalation intake. Therefore the point being made by the inspector is not relevant to the estimate of intake of this individual.
- C) Excretion and retention data, the derivation of which are described in NUREG 4884, were used to estimate the inhalation intake from the individual's bioassay data. The information referred to in item C was provided to the inspector as described in item B. Therefore the point being made in item C is also not relevant to the estimate of intake of this individual.
- D) We will review our program for making intake estimates, and will revise that program as deemed necessary.

We trust that this information is responsive to your request; however, should you have additional questions or desire additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation


Warren P. Murphy
Senior Vice President, Operations

/dm

cc: USNRC Regional Administrator, Region I
USNRC Resident Inspector, VYNPS
USNRC Project Manager, VYNPS