

MAR 23 1984

DISTRIBUTION:
EHEB RDG
EHEB File
WVJohnston
RBallard
RSamworth
GLaRoche

Docket No. 50-537

NOTE FOR: T. King, Acting Director
CRBR Program Office

THRU: William V. Johnston, Assistant Director
Materials, Chemical & Environmental Technology
Division of Engineering

FROM: Ronald L. Ballard, Chief
Environmental & Hydrologic Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

SUBJECT: CONTACT POINT FOR CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR SITE REDRESS

According to the Commissioners' Memo and Order of August 17, 1982, the NRC has a commitment to see that the CRBR site is redressed in an environmentally acceptable manner. While the technical expertise for reviewing redress and restoration activities resides in the Environmental and Hydrologic Engineering Branch, we do not normally assume responsibility for initiating or managing activities of this type.

Because much of this work will not be started for a year and because the CRBR Program Office will be eliminated this month, we suggest that an NRC contact be identified and that DOE be advised who within NRC will be responsible for followup work on the Commissioners' Order.

Original signed by Ronald L. Ballard

Ronald L. Ballard, Chief
Environmental & Hydrologic
Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

B512300067 851203
PDR FOIA
BELL85-362 PDR

OFFICE	DE: EHEB	DE: EHEB	DE: EHEB	DE: BDMCET		
SURNAME	GLaRoche:ws	RBSamworth	RLBallard	WVJohnston		E/18
DATE	3/20/84	3/17/84	3/27/84	3/27/84		

OVERSIZE DOCUMENT PAGE PULLED

SEE APERTURE CARDS

NUMBER OF PAGES: 3

ACCESSION NUMBER(S):

8512300067-01
thru-03

APERTURE CARD/HARD COPY AVAILABLE FROM RECORD SERVICES BRANCH, TIDC
FTS 492-8989

J. LaRoche

APR 30 1984

Docket No. 50-537

MEMORANDUM FOR: T. King, Acting Chief
CRBR Program Office

FROM: Ronald L. Ballard, Chief
Environmental & Hydrologic
Engineering Branch, DE

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF PROPOSED CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR (CRBR)
SITE REDRESS PLAN

We have reviewed the CRBR site redress plan submitted March 5, 1984. We find the proposed course of action generally acceptable but recommend that DOE consider two modifications.

The proposed action addresses site specific concerns in an acceptable manner. Existing erosion and sediment control facilities will remain in place and will be maintained until the site is completely redressed. Site redress will commence this year on those areas that will not foreclose the option of developing the site for generalized industrial use. The site will be subject to inspection by USEPA for compliance with NPDES permit requirements.

In granting an exemption for 10 CFR 50.10 pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12 to initiate site preparation the Commissioners' Memorandum and Order of August 17, 1982 accepted DOE's claim that the site was redressable and therefore the Commission could grant in part the requested exemption. The redress plan submitted on March 5, 1984 is not identical to the site redress plan provided to the Commission in the DOE Site Preparation Activities Report of June 1982, because all facilities proposed at that time and permitted (by Commissioners' Memorandum and Order of 8/17/82) have not been completed or even begun. The main differences are: (1) the barge facility and sewage treatment plant were not even started; (2) the area for the quarry was cleared and grubbed but quarrying was never started; and (3) the railroad bed was cleared, grubbed and leveled, but the ballast was not applied.

The two recommended modifications to the redress plan are: (1) DOE should report to NRC on the status of the site prior to starting the final filling, grading and redress since completion of redress will likely be delayed. The report at that time should include a schedule for specific final redress of the site, and (2) the redress plan should be revised as appropriate to reflect consideration of alternative use if the site is retained by DOE. If another

E/19

user is not found, the immediate use of the site will be to incorporate it into Oak Ridge's Forestry Management Program. This usage might merit some revision to the redress plans. For example, optimal forestry usage might make it desirable to retain one or more of the sedimentation ponds. These ponds would also be beneficial for wildlife. Additionally, for forestry management objectives, certain areas, such as the craft parking lot, might be of greater potential value if covered with soil to an appropriate depth rather than if left covered with limestone aggregate.

A second visit to the site was made on April 24, 1984 to accompany the intervenor's representative, Dr. Edward E. Clebsch. Also present on this site visit was Mr. John Wojtowicz, a water quality expert with the State of Tennessee, Mr. George Edgar, lawyer for the applicants, Mr. Peter Gross and Mr. Jerry Wing of the CRBR Project Office, and Mr. Paul Leech, NRC. This tour did not result in the identification of a need for a change in the redress plan.

This review was performed by G. LaRoche.

Original Signed by
Ronald L. Ballard

for Ronald L. Ballard, Chief
Environmental & Hydrologic
Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

cc: S. Turk, ELD
W. Johnston
R. Samworth
G. LaRoche

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket Files
EHEB Rdg
EHEB File
RBallard

DE:EHEB
GLaRoche:ws
4/27/84

DE:EHEB
RBSamworth
4/ /84

RLB
DE:EHEB
RLBallard
4/2/84