5.56.

D503

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

(3)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

June 5, 1984[1]

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Glenn O. Bright
Dr. James H. Carpenter
James L. Kelley, Chairman

In the Matter of CAROLINA POWER AND LIGHT CO. et al. (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1)	Docket 50-400 OL ASLBP No. 82-468-01 OL

Wells Eddleman's Response to Summary Disposition on Contention 67

Much of Applicants' Motion & Affidavit, and Staff's "Response" and first affiant's testimony, is irrelevant because the Southeast Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW) Compact has not yet been approved by Congress. This key fact, they ignore. "Progress" as they allege is not assurance. Nor do they deny that the Compact has failed to be approved so far.

As to the contingency plans for handling low-level radioactive wastes, I think there's a genuine material issue of fact between the Applicants' affiant, the Staff's affiant (2d), and the FSAR, Table 11.4.2-1 (Amendment 5), attached with my notations. While CP&L claims (no supporting square footages are provided) they can store about 7.5 times the normal 1020 (55-gallon) drum capacity of the Harris Waste Processing Building on-site, this amount is only about a year's storage at the Table 11.4.2-1 level. CP&L presents no discussion of this table or the reasons for differences between it and their affiant Warriner's statement (item 10,p.5 of affidavit). Staff noticed the discrepancy, and says it's OK, but they never explain why. They just offer their

[1]Judge Kelley orally approved filing on this date; Staff Response was received 5/30/84.

second affiant's unsupported opinion (Willis affidavit, item 14, p.4). The Staff says they've done a calculation but do not provide it. It's hard to respond to a calculation you can't see.

However, examination of the FSAR Table (attached) shows some serious discrepancies Evidently, Applicants' affiant simply halved the number of drums in the rightmost column of the Table, assuming volume reduction as in note "**" of the table for evaporator bottoms. A conservative calculation on the maximum volume shown in the table gives about a year's storage even using the whole WPB available space to store LLRW.

The halving is unjustified, as shown by the calculations I made on the attached Table. The compressed dry solids are already allowed 4:1 reduction of volume, and then computed as 6 ft^3 per drum -- close to the 7.33 ft^3 maximum capacity of a 55-gallon drum. Moreover, re-expansion of compressed material, and space-filling problems where the LLRW is solid (as here) and may have shape or objects in it that won't fully fill a space (like trash in a trash can). Finally, used protective clothing and so on may not stay compressed even to 4:1.

But CP&L's halving the numbers of drums implies that each 55 gallonx drum will hold 10 or 12 cubic feet of LLRW. That just isn't so. The internal volume is only about 7 and 1/3 cubic feet. Now there seems to be no penalty for errors (or false statements or misleading ones) made by Staff or Applicants' affiants, but at the least affidavits so far discrepant with the information in the FSAR are a material issue of fact.

Finally, the Staff's "Turkey Point test" ("Response at 7) held that 6 years' safe storage was enough. If corrected for errors, as shown above, the Harris facility can hold at most a year or two-'s worth of LLRW. This isn't enough time -- the facility has an operating life of 25 years (estimated), and there's no guarantee of a ratified compact by 1988 nor have Staff or Applicants asserted any such guarantee.