

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION****Date:**

February 21, 2012

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD****Mail Control  
or Report No(s).**

576543

**License No(s).**

01-25284-01

**Docket No(s).**

03033440

**Name of Licensee:**

Tennessee Valley Authority

**Name of Participant(s):**

J. W. Shea, Manager, Corporate Licensing

L. Miller, Corporate Licensing

**Telephone No.**

(423) 751-6887

(423) 751-3197

**Subject:**

Telecom regarding amendment request, letter dated 12/12/2011

**(NOTE: This will be used as the  
Documents Title in ADAMS)**

On February 14, 2012, I left a voice-mail for Mr. Shea.

On February 15, 2012, Mr. Lee Miller returned my call and left a voice message.

On February 16, 2012, I contacted Mr. Miller, who included Jay Hinson, contractor regarding the PCB program. Mr. Miller confirmed that TVA is requesting to amend the authorized use description in License Condition 9 to provide a more comprehensive basis for determining the chemically hazardous constituents of the low level radioactive waste that is possessed and stored at the TVA Mixed Waste Facility in Muscle Shoals, Alabama. Specifically, TVA identified the need to store some low level radioactive waste that contains polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and are requesting that your License Condition 9 include (40 CFR 761) to authorize PCB.

In addition, Mr. Hinson provided the background behind TVA's amendment request and Mr. Miller confirmed that TVA currently does not possess this material at the Muscle Shoals facility.

Also, I informed Mr. Miller that TVA must conduct an evaluation of its Decommissioning Funding Plan (DFP) cost estimate because the amendment request adds PCB as a type of contaminated material at the facility. I inquired if TVA had already conducted an evaluation of the DFP cost estimate to determine if PCB will increase the DFP by greater than 10% and how long it would take to conduct the evaluation. Mr. Miller stated that he will need to consult a colleague, and that he will provide an answer by Wednesday, February 22, 2012.

I informed Mr. Miller that if the outcome of the evaluation indicates a change in the DFP cost estimate by greater than 10%, TVA will be required to submit a revised DFP. If TVA already conducted an evaluation of the DFP cost estimate, TVA should submit it (or the revised DFP, if applicable) to the NRC by February 24, 2012 so that we may continue our review.

However, if TVA had not already conducted an evaluation of the DFP cost estimate, TVA should submit a request to withdraw the amendment, and NRC will void the amendment request without prejudice. Then TVA may resubmit an

amendment request with either the evaluation or revised DFP, as applicable.

**Action Required: Send TVA an RAI Letter via e-mail; submit RAI and telecom into ADAMS; await TVA reply to complete action.**

Document Availability:

Publicly Available

Non-Publicly Available

Non-Sensitive

Non-Sensitive Copyright

Sensitive- Proprietary

Sensitive – Privacy Act/ PII

Sensitive – Internal

Sensitive – Security-Related

Immediate Release

Normal Release Date: 02/29/2012

Delayed Release Date:

SUNSI Review Completed By:

Laurie Kauffman

/ RA /

Document Accession #:

ML120520639