

TWX INCOMING

DOCKET NO.

40-8027

For Div. of Compliance

1970 MAY 13 PM 6 15

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMM.  
TWX UNIT

THIS IS KERR-MCGEE CORP. OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA. MAY 13, 1970 500PM

MR. DON HARMON

SOURCE MATERIAL LICENSING  
DIVISION OF MATERIALS LICENSING  
UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20454

REFER SOURCE MATERIAL LICENSE SUB-1010 DOCKET NO. 40-8027.  
PLEASE BE ADVISED OF THE STATUS OF LIQUID EFFLUENT PLANS FOR START-UP  
OF UF6 PRODUCTION OPERATIONS AT KERR-MCGEE SEQUOYAH FACILITY. WE  
INTEND TO RELEASE THE LIQUID SCRUBBER STREAM AT ABOUT 90 GPM TO THE  
ILLINOIS RIVER IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STANDARDS OF 10 CFR 20. EFFLUENT  
STREAM IS ANTICIPATED TO CONTAIN ONLY ABOUT 10 PERCENT OF APPLICABLE  
MPC. ADEQUATE MONITORING OF RELEASES TO THE UNRESTRICTED AREA WILL  
BE CONDUCTED BY SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS TO DEMONSTRATE COMPLIANCE.  
RAFFINATE EFFLUENT WILL CONTINUE TO BE HELD IN RETENTION BASINS. AS  
YOU ARE AWARE, THE PENDING AEC DECISION ON APPROVAL OF LIQUID WASTE  
DISPOSAL VIA THE DEEP WELL NECESSITATES THIS ACTION TO ALLOW CONTINUED  
FACILITY OPERATION. THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS FURNISHED REALIZING THAT  
THE DISPOSAL METHOD COULD BE CONSTRUED AS A CHANGE OF INTENT AS REGARDS  
THE DEMONSTRATION PORTION OF THE LICENSE APPLICATION.

G. E. WULLER  
NUCLEAR DIVISION  
KERR-MCGEE CORPORATION  
MSG. NO. 1028

TKS END OR GA PLS

TWX INCOMING

R OK NX END

8507310275 850530  
PDR FOIA  
BURR85-229 PDR

1459

DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE  
Memo Route Slip

R. W. Kirkman Region I		RE: KERR-MCGEE CORPORATION LICENSE NO. SUB-1010  On May 15, 1970, a meeting was held with Mr. Parker Dunn, Group Vice-President, and Mr. George Parks, Executive Vice-President of the subject licensee. Mr. Dunn reports to Mr. Parks who in turn reports to Mr. McGee, Chairman of the Board of Kerr-McGee Corporation. Also present were George Wuller, Licensing Officer, and A. M. Valentine, Senior Staff Engineer (Health Physics). AEC was represented by Gene Coryell, Jack Finn and I.  We discussed the results of (1) the initial inspection of the plutonium facility; (2) the reinspection of the uranium facility; and (3) the results of the Region IV inspection of the Sequoyah facility. With respect to the last mentioned, I went over each item of noncompliance set forth in your May 4, 1970 memorandum. Extensive notes were taken by Messrs. Dunn and Parks, and after each item was discussed, assurance
J. G. Davis Region II		
B. H. Grier Region III		
D. I. Walker Region IV		
R. W. Smith Region V		
G. D. Brown Region IV	X	ance was given that corrective action would be taken. None of the Kerr-McGee personnel disputed the items of noncompliance.

I also discussed the safety item, i.e., the lack of corporate audits of the Sequoyah facility to assure compliance and safety. Mr. Dunn agreed that this was necessary and said that he would instruct Mr. Valentine or Mr. Wuller to conduct these audits. I informed Mr. Dunn that he would receive a letter from Mr. Low setting forth the items of noncompliance.

cc: Region III

FROM:

*Jack R. Roeder*  
Jack R. Roeder

DATE: May 20, 1970

PART 1

Inspector

*Loos & Brown*I II  
InitialDate of Inspection: 4/29 & 4/30/70Licensee: Kress-McGee Corp.Oklahoma City.

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

License No.: SUB-1010 (Dr 40-8027)

II:

AEC-591 \_\_\_\_\_

A. Clear case (Initial/Reinsp) \_\_\_\_\_

B. Clear case (F/U of 592) \_\_\_\_\_

C. Noncompliance case \_\_\_\_\_

III:

AEC-417 ✓A. Immediate Public Health and Safety  
Threat \_\_\_\_\_B. Expenditure of more than nominal sum  
for compliance \_\_\_\_\_C. Excess of 90 days appears necessary  
to achieve enforcement \_\_\_\_\_D. N/C items of particular  
complexity \_\_\_\_\_; Licensing  
problems \_\_\_\_\_; Requires  
Headquarters interpretation \_\_\_\_\_E. Appropriate for "Notice of Alleged  
Violation" \_\_\_\_\_F. Uncorrected previous noncompliance  
\_\_\_\_\_G. Other Complaint

IV:

AEC-592 \_\_\_\_\_

A. Involves nonsignificant risk \_\_\_\_\_

B. Involves significant risk \_\_\_\_\_

Date Dispatched MAY 20 1970

Suspense Date \_\_\_\_\_

V and VI:

1. Adequate reply received from licensee:

\_\_\_\_\_; Copy to L&R for info \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

2. Inadequate reply received from licensee:

Forwarded to L&R for action \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)3. No reply received from licensee and  
forwarded to L&R for actionNote: If F/U is made on No. 1, 2, or 3  
above, check a. or b. below:

a. F/U shows satisfactory corrective action:

cy AEC-591 to L&amp;R for info \_\_\_\_\_

TWX report to L&amp;R \_\_\_\_\_

b. F/U shows incomplete corrective action:

TWX report to L&amp;R \_\_\_\_\_

VII:

ELAPSED DAYS INFO:

No. of days from date of Inspection to  
issuance of AEC-592:

10 or less \_\_\_\_\_; 11 to 15 \_\_\_\_\_; 16 to 20 \_\_\_\_\_;

21 to 25 \_\_\_\_\_; over 25 \_\_\_\_\_

From issuance of AEC-592 to licensee reply:

20 or less \_\_\_\_\_; 21 to 30 \_\_\_\_\_; 31 to 40 \_\_\_\_\_;

over 40 \_\_\_\_\_

From Inspection date to date of F/U Inspection:

20 or less \_\_\_\_\_; 21 to 40 \_\_\_\_\_; 41 to 60 \_\_\_\_\_;

61 to 90 \_\_\_\_\_; 91 to 120 \_\_\_\_\_

VIII:

Additional follow-up by agreement with L&R  
\_\_\_\_\_