

MAR 9 1994

Mr. Denny Galloway
Supervisory Radiation Control
Physicist
State of Connecticut Department
of Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Dear Mr. Galloway:

This refers to your letter of February 7, 1994, to Ms. Marie Miller of our Region I staff requesting information concerning liquid discharges from the Combustion Engineering (CE), Windsor, Connecticut, facilities and the status of actions related to high-enriched uranium contamination of various onsite buildings and locations. Our responses to the specific questions in your letter are provided in the enclosure to this letter.

If you have questions regarding our responses, please contact Mr. Jerry Roth at (301) 504-3427 or me at (301) 504-3493.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:

Robert C. Pierson, Chief
Licensing Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards, NMSS

Enclosure: As stated

Distribution: w/encl.

Docket No. 70-1100 PDR NRC File Center MAdams
NMSS R/F FCSS R/F FCLB R/F FCLS2 R/F
Region I JNoggle, RI
*See previous concurrence

OFC	FCOB	E	FCLB*	E	FCLB*	E	FCLB*	E	Region I*	E
NAME	JRoth		SSoong		VTharpe		MTokar		JJoyner	
DATE	03/8/94		03/01/94		03/01/94		03/08/94		03/08/94	
OFC	FCLB	E								
NAME	RPierson									
DATE	3/9/94									

C = COVER

E = COVER & ENCLOSURE N = NO COPY
OFFICIAL RECO COPY
G:\LTRGALLO.JR

100171

9403150237 940309
PDR ADDCK 07001100
C PDR

NFIS 1/1

Responses to Questions from State of Connecticut
Department of Environmental Protection

Question 1

Per Combustion Engineering's (CE) NRC license, are effluents from building 3 floor drains and laboratory sinks expected to drain to building 6 effluent retention tanks prior to proceeding to one of the two 50,000 gallon industrial effluent tanks?

Response

During the mid 1980s, the licensee severed all discharge lines between Buildings 3 and 6 (liquid effluent retention tanks) as a result of a backup of contaminated waters from the Building 6 tanks to a pit located in Building 3. The exact dates of the work can be obtained from CE. An NRC inspector observed this work while in progress. As a result of this work, no Building 3 effluents are discharged through the Building 6 complex.

Question 2

It is DEP's understanding that CE has applied to the Department of Energy (DOE) for economic and technical guidance to facilitate the remediation of certain buildings and property at the CE Windsor site. We have been tentatively told by the NRC that the contaminated wooded area is under the cognizance of the DOE. During discussions with CE representatives, they indicated that DOE has not yet accepted any of the CE property under the Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).

If this is correct, then who is the cognizant federal agency? Who becomes the cognizant federal agency if the DOE does not accept the contaminated wooded area and other areas under FUSRAP?

Response

CE has applied to the Department of Energy (DOE) for economic and technical guidance to facilitate the remediation of certain buildings and property at the Windsor site. DOE has established a tentative working authority to allow DOE to evaluate the extent of contamination in affected buildings and areas at the Windsor site. According to DOE officials, actions are underway to establish cleanup authority which would allow for payment of contracts associated with remediation of the affected areas. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has incorporated conditions into the CE license which include requirements for identifying areas contaminated with high-enriched uranium. As a result, if DOE cannot establish proper authority to remediate the site, the NRC will assure that CE provide the funds to cleanup the site under the NRC's Atomic Energy Act authority.

Enclosure

Question 3

In NRC Inspection No. 70-1100/92-03, it is noted "In addition, it has been determined that a site creek which leads to the Farmington River is contaminated with uranium and will require remediation."

Is the DOE the cognizant federal agency in this case? When will this area be remediated?

Response

A DOE contractor has performed a survey of the site creek the results of which have not yet been described. If high-enriched uranium is found, DOE will ensure cleanup of the creek in accordance with its authority. If low-enriched uranium is found, cleanup will be performed by CE in accordance with NRC license requirements. However, since the site is covered under an NRC special nuclear material license, cleanup in accordance with NRC requirements may be delayed until license termination.

Questions 4 and 5

Is there any present danger to public health and safety or the environment with regard to the contaminated wooded area and the contaminated stream?

Mr. Jack Moulton of CE, indicated it could be another 10 years before any site remediation might take place for those areas, CE is attempting to get DOE resources. If this is correct, would the added time to remediation present any additional risk to the public or environment?

Response

There does not appear to be any present or near-future (10 years) danger to public health and safety or the environment as a result of the contaminated wooded area or the stream based on 1) CE's site characterization data, 2) the NRC survey results obtained by the NRC contractor, Oak Ridge Associated Universities, in the previously identified contaminated areas in the onsite woods, and 3) the independent analysis of effluent water samples, obtained by the NRC inspector at the site sewage treatment plant discharge weir and in the site creek.