

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

**From:** marvin i lewis <marvlewis@juno.com>  
**To:** <marvlewis@juno.com>, <NRCREP@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Thu, Jul 13, 2006 12:27 PM

2006 JUL 14 AM 11: 20

>From Marvin Lewis  
3133 Fairfield St.  
Phila., PA 19136  
215 676 1291  
marvlewis@juno.com

5/31/06

41 FR 30964

RECEIVED

To USNRC Commissioners  
NRCREP@nrc.gov  
Attn.: Anna Bradford

(1)

Dear Sirs and Ms,

Please accept this e mail as my comments on NUREG 1954. Part 1  
General Comments:

1. This review is premature, unnecessary and costly to commenters. They  
gist and meat of the matter will only come out when DOE presents its  
concentration and dosage limits for the waste in question whatever the  
waste will be named at that future time.

Therefore I suggest for a reasonable comment period to be  
specified whenever DOE comes out with its closely guarded concentration  
and dosage specifications.

2. Although NUREG 1854 gives a plethora of references, the references do  
not go into the very succinct history which leads up to the public's low  
confidence in nuclear power. Most Wall St newspapers remember the debacle  
of slow construction that lead to many cost overruns. Most Harrisburg  
residents remember the TMI#2 accident. A recent episode where a corrosion  
hole in a pressure vessel only had a few inches of stainless steel  
remaining between another accident and a timely shutdown, a hole that was  
photographed 2 years prior to 'discovery.' These are the types of  
references that I would like to see in NRC documents so that I know that  
institutional memory has not been impaired to the point of 'institutional  
Alzheimer.'

3. Throughout this SRP I see many paperwork procedures, routines and  
manipulations. I see very few site visits. Paperwork is easy if no one  
checks that actual site. Many a transportation company have their 'black  
boxes' sitting on junkers while they report only new equipment on the  
highway. Many a bank has reported all sorts of cash in the vault when  
there was none, a favorite ploy during the Depression in America. 1100  
mobile homes sat ready in Hope, Arkansas, and no trucks came to haul  
them to New Orleans, but only an enterprising reporter on site was able  
to get the tale out.

I would prefer to see site visits with local residents to be sure  
of what is really going on.

4. The repercussions from GATT, NAFTA, WTO and many other international  
treaties and trade agreements may make many recommendations of NUREG 1854  
mute.

"4. Each member shall ensure the conformity of its laws, regulation and  
administrative procedures with its obligations as provided in the annexed  
Agreements."

Wijaya round of GATT/NAFTA 4-15-94 in Marrakech, Morocco

will impact nuclear waste determinations and location. Are we going to have all these comments and iterations only to have to change our regulations to meet foreign influence? I would also like to know how the monies going overseas from the IRS 761 partnership agreements will impact waste site investment?

#### Egregious Deficiencies:

1. The most Egregious deficiency that smacks the reader is that this comment period must proceed in a fog of NOTHING! Commenters are required to comment on a method without knowing the most important specifics of what they are commenting upon.

2.44 Page 41 of 153 line 9: "Waste that exceeds class C concentration limits...incidental waste" or "that AS DOE MAY AUTHORIZE."

At some time in the future DOE may require anything to be called incidental waste and that incidental waste may be handled in any way that the licensee and agencies deem proper without further public comment. The only limitation will be that the result is "comparable to 10CFR61" where comparable is not defined in a clear and technical manner, and the licensee does the analysis.

Does 'comparable' mean the limits in 10CFR61 is exceeded by 10, 20 or thousands of percent? Does that mean that anything that the licensee wants is ok? This licensee omniscience has been the case too often: TMI#2, Gin na, ad infinitum, ad nauseum.

At a very minimum, the comment period for NUREG 1854 should be extended to 30 days after the DOE releases the new concentration and exposure limits.

2. This theme that 10 CFR61 may be changed, eliminated, or vaporized continues: 2.4.5 line 37 Alternatives to performance objectives of 10CFR61Subpart C is an invitation to the licensees to lobby the NRC to increase profits and to reduce burden of doing an adequate job at the expense of the public which will get little benefit and maybe cancer while the licensee gets the profit.

The repetition and the many areas that are explored to tell how ubiquitous the DOE ability to change limits is suggests that these limits might be greater than explored in the NUREG. A question arises whether the DOE can also determine to allow 'below regulatory limit' definitions into its new limits under a different name.

3. The value of human life is minimized at \$2000 per person rem. This number depends greatly on the inflation rate when discounted over the centuries. Please note that the inflation rate has been at a low rate and is now showing signs of large increases. You can check this statement the next time you get a latte'. An effort to tie this \$2000 to actual mortality data and discount rate would be appropriate.

4. Using a period of 1000 yrs might be appropriate if there was a comparison to the entire period where the exposures will occur. If the first 1000 years shows a small increase where the remaining eternity of exposures shows a startling total of mortalities, this comparison should be considered.

Chauncey Kepford, Ph. D., made this comparison in an NRC hearing decades ago. one of the Administrative Law Judges, Walter Jordan, Ph. D., remarked that it was difficult to argue that future lives have no value and that is exactly what I am saying: future lives have value and should not be ignored whether they exist less than a thousand years from now or 10,000 years from now.

OR 100,000 YEARS FROM NOW.

Profit for a few vs harm to many:

5. Further, the demand for new waste sites is profit, not need driven. The reason for this untimely changing of the regulations is to assure the financial community future profitability.

How numbers are manipulate.

Throughout these regulations, numbers have been manipulated or ignored. Much of the rad waste siting money is invested by the 761 partnerships in foreign lands, and may not be available in a timely fashion for waste site construction and emergencies. These IRS 761 partnerships are ignored in NUREG 1854. The need for dollars in a timely fashion is ignored.

How numbers are manipulated.

Senator Santorum shows how numbers on any subject can be manipulated. He answered a letter of mine about energy pointing out a familiar statistic: "The number of oil refineries in the US has dropped from 342 to 148." What the Santorum letter fails to point out is that the better technology has increased the output of the 148 remaining refineries four fold!

148 X 4=592 We are producing as much gasoline in 148 refineries now as we were producing if we had 592 refineries 30 year ago.

Again and again this NUREG 1854 fails to ask the important questions. Should we explore more construction of waste sites when better technology might allow the need for fewer waste sites? Should we look to raising concentration limits and exposures when alternative technologies provide answers to energy needs that do not need rad waste sites? Should we invite the licensees to manipulate numbers and lobby agencies or promote more benign technologies?

I am sure that you feel that the agencies are unassailable as the US Congress, and that you would like me to contact Tom Delay to tell me how very pure the US government has been.

NUREG 1854 is being manipulated to look like the NRC and DOE are doing something substantive when all that is being done are manipulations to make profitability trump safety.

**Mail Envelope Properties** (44B6747D.723 : 7 : 46883)**Subject:****Creation Date**

Thu, Jul 13, 2006 12:26 PM

**From:**marvin i lewis <[marvlewis@juno.com](mailto:marvlewis@juno.com)>**Created By:**[marvlewis@juno.com](mailto:marvlewis@juno.com)**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

**Post Office**

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

**Files**

MESSAGE

Mime.822

**Size**

8017

9185

**Date & Time**

Thursday, July 13, 2006 12:26 PM

**Options****Expiration Date:**

None

**Priority:**

Standard

**ReplyRequested:**

No

**Return Notification:**

None

**Concealed Subject:**

No

**Security:**

Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling

This message was not classified as Junk Mail

**Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered**

Junk Mail handling disabled by User

Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator

Junk List is not enabled

Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled

Block List is not enabled