



Department of Energy  
Chicago Operations Office  
9800 South Cass Avenue  
Argonne, Illinois 60439

MAR 20 1984

Mr. John G. Davis, Director  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards  
ATTN: Program Support  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Davis:

SUBJECT: ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY PROPOSAL, "ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT ON DECOMMISSIONING OF THE KERR-McGEE WEST CHICAGO RARE  
EARTHS FACILITY"

Reference: Letter from R. S. Brown, Jr. to H. J. Rauch (DOE/CH), dated  
December 1, 1983

In response to your request via the referenced letter, the Chicago  
Operations Office is pleased to submit the NRC Form 189 and proposal to be  
sponsored by the Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards.  
Copies of this proposal were provided to you and the Chicago Operations  
Office (CH) concurrently on March 5, 1984.

CH has reviewed the proposed work scope and found it to be consistent with  
the requirements of NRC Manual Chapter 1102.

Notification of funding shall be through the Chicago Operations Office,  
ATTN: Hilary J. Rauch, Manager. Questions regarding the transmittal may  
be discussed with Roberta J. Dalton of my staff on FTS 972-2229.

Sincerely,

Billy D. Shipp, Director  
Technology Management Division

Enclosure:  
NRC 189 and Proposal (6 copies)

cc: R. W. Barber, DOE/HQ, w/encl.  
C. A. Beckwith, NRC/RM, w/encl.  
W. E. Massey, ANL, w/o encl.  
H. Drucker, ANL, w/o encl.

8508160400 850710  
PDR FOIA  
RAPKIN85-438 PDR

File 3.5  
A2157  
submitted  
3/27/84

MAR 27 1984  
RECTO  
INC

## PROJECT AND BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR NRC WORK

A2157

DATE

02-20-84

## PROJECT TITLE

Environmental Impact Statement on the Decommissioning of the Kerr-McGee West Chicago Rare Earths Facility

## DOE PROPOSING ORGANIZATION

FORECAST MILESTONE CHART: Scheduled to Start —  — Completed (Shown in Quarter Year)  
PROVIDE ESTIMATED DOLLAR COST FOR EACH TASK FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

## TASK

FY 1984				FY				FY				FY				FY			
1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th

Evaluation of disposal  
plan and preparation  
of final report

SCHEDULE



COST

\$100.0

SCHEDULE

COST

SCHEDULE

COST

SCHEDULE

COST

SCHEDULE

COST

TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST

\$100.0 (hearings initiated in FY84 expected to carry  
into FY85)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (Provide narrative descriptions of the following topics in the order listed. Attach on plain paper to this NRC Form 189. If an item is not applicable, so state.)

1. OBJECTIVE OF PROPOSED WORK
2. SUMMARY OF PRIOR EFFORTS
3. WORK TO BE PERFORMED AND EXPECTED RESULTS
4. DESCRIPTION OF ANY FOLLOW-ON EFFORTS
5. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROJECTS
6. REPORTING SCHEDULE
7. SUBCONTRACTOR INFORMATION
8. LIST NEW CAPITAL EQUIPMENT REQUIRED
9. DESCRIBE SPECIAL FACILITIES REQUIRED
10. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INFORMATION

SEE NRC MANUAL CHAPTER 1102 FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

APPROVAL AUTHORITY—SIGNATURE

DATE

2/21/84

FIN NO: A2157

Date: February 20, 1984

PROJECT TITLE: Environmental Impact Statement on the Decommissioning of the  
Kerr-McGee West Chicago Rare Earths Facility

1. Objective of Proposed Work

The objective of this extended work is to evaluate whether Kerr-McGee's proposed plan to stabilize residues at the inactive thorium facility located in West Chicago, Illinois, is in compliance with the technical requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) standards governing stabilization of uranium and thorium residues which were promulgated in October 1983.

2. Summary of Prior Efforts

The Final Environmental Statement (FES) for the decommissioning of the West Chicago facility was completed and issued in May 1983. The alternatives considered in the FES included onsite disposal, onsite storage, offsite disposal at potentially suitable sites within Illinois, offsite disposal at existing disposal sites, temporary storage by covering ore residues, segregation of wastes according to level of contamination, and no action. Environmental impact and cost analyses were performed for all the alternatives. Comments on the Draft Environmental Statement were addressed by specific responses in the FES.

3. Work to be Performed and Expected Results

Kerr-McGee's proposed disposal cell design for onsite waste stabilization (Alternative I in FES) will be evaluated with respect to EPA's closure standards set forth in 40 CFR 192 regarding the longevity of the cell cover design and the control of radon release to the atmosphere. The disposal plan will also be compared with the EPA's closure performance standards of 40 CFR 264 for minimal maintenance of the disposal site and long-term groundwater protection. The study results will be presented in a report which will be prepared and submitted to NRC according to the Reporting Schedule.

4. Description of any Follow-on Efforts

It is anticipated that ANL staff will be called upon to assist in providing expert testimony for the NRC Atomic Safety Licensing Board hearing. The schedule for testimony is unpredictable. However, it is anticipated that it will be initiated in FY 1984 and carry into FY 1985.

5. Relationship to Other Projects

This is a continuation of a project initiated in FY 1982.

6. Reporting Schedule

The report will be prepared according to the following schedule:

Draft report sent to NRC	May 1, 1984
ANL receives NRC's review comments	May 15, 1984
Final report sent to NRC	June 1, 1984

A monthly letter report will be submitted by the 15th of the month to Mr. W.A. Nixon, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. These reports will include the following:

- (1) A listing of efforts completed during the period; milestones reached, or if missed, an explanation provided.
- (2) Any problems or delays encountered or anticipated and recommendations for resolution.
- (3) A summary of costs and progress to date.
- (4) Plans for the next report period.

7. Subcontractor Information

Not applicable.

8. List of New Capital Equipment Required

None.

9. Describe Special Facilities Required

None.

10. Conflict of Interest Information

There are no known significant contractual or organizational relationships of this organization or its employees with industries regulated by NRC (e.g., utilities) and suppliers thereof that might give rise to an apparent or actual conflict of interest.