

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: March 26, 2013  
 Received: March 18, 2013  
 Status: Pending\_Post  
 Tracking No. 1jx-849s-rga6  
 Comments Due: March 18, 2013  
 Submission Type: Web

**Docket:** NRC-2013-0004

Retrievability, Cladding Integrity and Safe Handling of Spent Fuel at an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation and During Transportation

**Comment On:** NRC-2013-0004-0001

Retrievability, Cladding Integrity and Safe Handling of Spent Fuel at an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation and During Transportation

**Document:** NRC-2013-0004-DRAFT-0007

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-00478

11/17/2013  
 78 FR 3853

12

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Bob Mitchell

**Address:**

49 Yankee Road  
 Rowe, MA, 01367

**Organization:** Yankee Atomic Electric Company

RECEIVED

013 MAR 26 AM 9:49

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
 BRANCH  
 USIPPC

## General Comment

See attached file(s)

## Attachments

BYR 2013-016 - YAEC Response to NRC Request for Comments

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM - 013

E-RIDS= ADM -03

Add= B. White (bhw)

# YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC COMPANY

Telephone (413) 424-5261



49 Yankee Road, Rowe, Massachusetts 01367

March 18, 2013  
BYR 2013-016

Cindy Bladey, Chief  
Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB)  
Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Yankee Atomic Electric Company  
Yankee Rowe Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation  
NRC License No. DPR-3 (NRC Docket Nos. 50-029 and 72-31)


**Subject:** Yankee Atomic Electric Company's Response to the NRC's Request for Comments  
Regarding Retrievability, Cladding Integrity and Safe Handling of Spent Fuel at an  
Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation and During Transportation (Docket ID NRC-  
2013-0004)

Dear Ms. Bladey:

Yankee Atomic Electric Company (YAEC) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments in response to the subject request for comments regarding retrievability, cladding integrity and safe handling of spent fuel at an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation and during transportation. YAEC's responses to each of the subject section questions are provided in the attachment.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Robert M. Mitchell  
ISFSI Manager

c: W.M. Dean, NRC Region 1 Administrator  
M.S. Ferdas, Chief, Decommissioning Branch, NRC Region 1  
John Goshen, NRC Project Manager  
Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C.

## Attachment

YAEC's Response to the NRC's Request for Comment

**ATTACHMENT TO BYR 2013-016**  
**YAEC's Response to the NRC's Request for Comments**

**A. Acceptance of Spent Fuel by a Future Disposal or Reprocessing Facility**

1. Should an enhanced regulatory framework assume the licensee receiving spent fuel for disposal will be able to site and design a repository for direct disposal of these high capacity canisters without repackaging?

Response:

An as yet to be constructed federal nuclear waste repository or repositories will need to be designed to address the current and future inventory of commercial and defense spent nuclear fuel and Greater than Class C (GTCC) waste (SNF/HLW). Currently, there are over 1,700 dry storage systems with SNF/HLW deployed in the United States. At YAEC, there are 15 NRC licensed, NAC International Multi-Purpose Canister System (NAC-MPC System), dual-purpose (storage/transportation) canisters in dry casks storing spent nuclear fuel and 1 canister in dry casks storing GTCC waste.

The enhanced regulatory framework should not assume anything beyond the fact that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has the obligation to take possession and remove all SNF/HLW stored in the existing canister systems at the YAEC site under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the associated Standard Contract, and that the nation's nuclear waste management program and federal repository facility will need to address a broad spectrum of existing and future dry cask canister systems. YAEC will pursue re-licensing of the existing dual-purpose systems to ensure that the canisters storing the SNF and HLW can be safely stored and transported during the Certificate of Compliance renewal period. Accordingly, any rulemaking initiative to define specific assumptions associated with the design of a waste repository would place unnecessary limitations and preconditions on the back end of the fuel cycle.

2. Should an enhanced regulatory framework assume the repository licensee will be able to handle and repackage potentially degraded/damaged fuel on large production scales?

Response:

See YAEC's responses to Questions A.1 and A.4.

3. What effects, if any, would a canister-based retrievability policy have on a future reprocessing facility?

Response:

YAEC does not believe that a canister-based retrievability policy would have any impact on a potential future reprocessing facility. Any such facilities would be licensed and designed to have the appropriate engineering and quality controls in place to safely handle canistered spent fuel.

4. What other factors, such as cost, dose, should be considered?

Response:

Recent policy recommendations in the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future Final Report (January 2012) and the DOE's report, "Strategy for the Management and Disposal of Used Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste" (January 2013) propose that the spent nuclear fuel and GTCC waste stranded at stand-alone decommissioned reactor sites such as YAEC be removed and transported on a priority basis to a pilot consolidated storage facility. This consolidated storage

**ATTACHMENT TO BYR 2013-016**  
**YAEC's Response to the NRC's Request for Comments**

facility should be designed and licensed to handle and repackage potentially degraded/damaged fuel and address any retrievability, cladding integrity, and safe handling capability for spent fuel assemblies. Accordingly, it would be more cost effective and a more efficient location to repackage spent fuel assemblies, if that was required, than the stand-alone ISFSI sites, such as YAEC, that no longer possess either the capability or the licensing basis to retrieve spent fuel assemblies by normal means.

**B. Spent Fuel Retrievability During Storage**

Given the uncertainty with the material properties of high burn-up spent fuel, it is unclear whether some spent fuel may degrade during storage periods longer than 20 years and subsequent transportation. The NRC would like external stakeholders to provide an assessment of:

1. Whether ready-retrieval of individual spent fuel assemblies during storage should be maintained, or
2. Whether retrievability should be canister-based.

Response:

YAEC does not possess any high burn-up spent fuel assemblies, so this issue is not directly applicable. However, YAEC did can the damaged spent fuel assemblies to ensure assembly-based ready retrieval for storage purposes longer than the initial 20 year license period and during subsequent removal and transportation from the site by the DOE.

YAEC believes that retrievability can and should be canister based and that any necessary retrieval of SNF assemblies should be performed at a future DOE facility(ies). Spent fuel assembly retrieval or repackaging at sites designed for these tasks is safer than repackaging the material at the YAEC site, because the YAEC site no longer possesses either the capability or the licensing basis to retrieve spent fuel assemblies by normal means. The level of effort to establish such a capability at a stand-alone decommissioned site such as YAEC would be substantial and consolidating that capability at a DOE facility(ies) would be clearly more cost effective from a national waste management perspective.

**C. Cladding Integrity**

1. Should the spent fuel cladding continue to be protected from degradation that leads to gross rupture, or otherwise confine the spent fuel, during storage such that it will not pose operational safety problems with respect to its removal from storage? In particular, provide any explanatory information discussing the additional cost, dose, and effort required to repackage potentially damaged fuel over canned spent fuel, if the prohibition against gross deformation to the cladding were removed and the spent fuel required repackaging (whether by DOE or storage licensees).

Response:

YAEC believes that spent fuel cladding should be protected from degradation to the maximum extent practical during dry storage. However, because of the inherent design of the welded canisters stored at the site, YAEC does not believe that the canisters should be opened to inspect the spent fuel assemblies for damage or otherwise address concerns with the contents of the canister, except at a licensed DOE facility(ies) that is designed to do so. At stand-alone decommissioned reactor sites,

**ATTACHMENT TO BYR 2013-016**  
**YAEC's Response to the NRC's Request for Comments**

such as YAEC, the infrastructure and licensing basis for opening and/or repackaging a welded dry storage canister no longer exists.

2. Should each high burn-up spent fuel assembly be canned to ensure individual fuel assembly retrievability? Additionally, should spent fuel assemblies classified as damaged prior to loading continue to be individually canned prior to placement in a storage cask? In particular, NRC is interested in gathering input on the additional cost, dose, and effort required to place individual fuel assemblies in a damaged fuel can during storage cask loading. Comparison of the upfront cost, dose, and effort to can all high burn-up fuel assemblies against the cost, dose, and effort to repackaging potentially damaged fuel at a repository or prior to transport to a repository, may factor into NRC's retrievability policy decision making process.

Response:

YAEC does not possess any high burn-up spent fuel assemblies, so this issue is not directly applicable.

See the YAEC response to question B above for a discussion of repackaging spent fuel assemblies.

**D. Transportation Retrievability**

1. The NRC would like external stakeholders to comment on (a) whether retrievability should be extended to transportation packages after normal conditions of transportation (similar to the storage requirements), or (b) is it acceptable for high burn-up spent fuel to degrade such that damaged fuel may have to be handled when the package is opened? Extending retrievability to transportation may be important if the U.S. were to move to consolidated interim storage, and if the NRC were to maintain its current definition of assembly-based retrievability during storage.

Response:

Retrievability should be at the canister level after normal conditions of transportation. This will ensure that repackaging remains an option, not a requirement, when the DOE transports the SNF/HLW canisters to a DOE facility(ies).

2. If it is acceptable for the fuel to degrade, should the package application for a certificate of compliance provide a description of the design and operations of any facilities and methods necessary to handle the damaged fuel (at the facility that will open the package)?

Response:

The design and operation of the receiving DOE facility(ies) receiving both spent nuclear fuel and GTCC waste, including the capability for handling and repackaging SNF/HLW, should be addressed in that facilities' license application and approval. The inclusion of these design details in the Certificate of Compliance for the transportation casks would unnecessarily restrict the design of the facility or facilities that receives the SNF/HLW.