

4/13/99

Spent Fuel Pool

Mtg w NEI + Public:

Paul Turner

of Nuclear Info. and Research Service

- Very low level of public confidence
- No cost should be spared to protect public
- Once profit motive is lost, face greatest dangers
- risk-informed helps industry, not public
- decommissioning process is already in disarray.

Paul Blanch

member of the public, W. Hartford, CT

• appreciate you & others

• Part 50 is for Power Reactors

• Need a regulation for spent fuels

Part 72 is the right place

Part 72 is adequate for licensing spent fuel

• Need clear regulations for decommissioning

Part 50 Appendix A ?

Appendix B ?

Security Requirements ?

Potentials for Sabotage ?

Fitness for Duty ?

[etc.]

4/12

Cindy Faulkner

of Nuclear Info. + Research Service

Not just done assessment,

cleanup level for decommissioning

Raymond Shaddis

founder of Friends of the Coast

In area of public confidence:

More and more distrust as who NRC promulgates
as fact.

Strong statements from NRC reports that

Zirc fire is not only probable, but likely.

300 days

700 days

100 days

} to get a zirc fire -- who knows?

Responsiveness is critical to public confidence

and timeliness

Go to insurance industry re: risks. They are risk experts.

NEI:

NRC staff position has been that utility must show at what point they will no longer get a 2irc fire.

At that point, they get their exemptions.

What is the appropriate level of EP for a spent fuel pool?

Impossible to have a 2r fire

[Diff between op rx and spent fuel pool?

Longer times between initiator and water loss.

" " between water loss and heatup.

Ability of nat. circ. of air to cool spent fuel pool.

Paul Gunter

NEI should not look for NEI assurances prior to submitting staff to staff.

John Hannon

We will need time to digest NEI proposal and schedule another public mtg.

Paul Blanch

NUREG/CR-6451 not mentioned. This needs to be considered.

Sabotage vs. seismic

Application for Part 72 license is enough

Raymond Shadlis:

One side of spent fuel pool is not below grade.

David Lockbaum:

Selective look at seismic events -- not good.

Other events are very important.

Peter James Thornton:

Needs of public:

I used to work for NRC in 1970's on fire protection.

Public participation is being suppressed.

Consider whether re-criticality could occur and could result in an explosion.

Consider aging w/ development of seismic criteria.

John Zwolinski:

In these cases (of correspondence), we have not been timely.

We will have more steps like this one.

Adjudicatory process will most likely be used/available