To whom it may concern (and Anna),

Please find attached NRDC's comments on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's *Draft Interim Standard Review Plan for DOE Waste Determinations*. If you have any difficulty downloading or opening this file, please do not hesitate to contact me at the number below. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Geoff Fettus

5/31/06

71 FR 30967

(6)

Geoffrey H. Fettus, Senior Project Attorney
Natural Resources Defense Council
1200 New York Avenue, N.W. #400
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 289-2371
gfettus@nrdc.org

July 31, 2006

COMMENTS OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL ON THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S STANDARD REVIEW PLAN FOR ACTIVITIES RELATED TO U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY WASTE DETERMINATIONS

Introduction and summary

On May 31, 2006, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued its *Standard Review Plan for Activities Related to U.S. Department of Energy Waste Determinations, Draft Report for Interim Use and Comments* (hereinafter the "SRP"). We appreciate the opportunity to offer comments on a draft plan and we hope that these recommendations will improve several objectionable aspects of the document. We commend the NRC's effort to standardize its agency review of the Department of Energy's (DOE) high-level waste reclassifications. These are

[redacted]

public acceptance of agency action in what has been the most contentious of cleanup issues.

Specific Comments on the SRP
Comments on Introductory sections (pp. xiii-xx)

In these introductory sections, the NRC continues historical revision regarding the incidental waste concept. At xvi, the SRP first points to paragraphs 6 and 7 of a 1969 Atomic Energy Commission ("AEC") Proposed Statement of Policy on the *Siting of Commercial Fuel Reprocessing Plants and Related Waste Management Facilities* as a basis for the concept that certain items associated with reprocessing plant operations are "incidental" and need not be treated as HLW. The cited language, however, is nowhere to be found in the final rule. The SRP even acknowledges that the word "incidental" does not appear, nor does the list of items include any reference to direct reprocessing HLW, such as would be disposed of via the evaluation method of DOE's original incidental waste exemption. *See* 34 *Fed. Reg.* 8712; 35 *Fed. Reg.* 17530.[1] Moreover, while perhaps a theoretical starting point for the DOE's waste incidental to reprocessing citation method (which addresses the trash, such as laboratory items, clothing and tools that may become radioactively contaminated as a result of secondary exposure to highly radioactive reprocessing operations), the proposed rule cited by the NRC has no application to the highly radioactive waste in the tanks.[2]

Next, the SRP cites the NRC's consideration of a similar, though far narrower, exemption in an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in 1987. The NRC withdrew this proposal,

[redacted]

will allow waste to be determined to be not high-level. The source cited for these criteria is a discussion of historical background information in a NRC Federal Register notice denying a petition for rulemaking. However, this denial ... did not establish generic criteria for determining if waste is high-level. In fact, it did just the opposite. It should be noted that the statutory and regulatory justification for the whole concept of the "incidental waste" approach is extremely tenuous. It ultimately rests on language in a proposed rule for Appendix F of 10 CFR 50, which language was **not** included in the final rule. This is not a firm foundation for a declaration that waste is outside NRC's licensing jurisdiction. Thus, care must be taken to avoid stretching this concept past the breaking point, if it is not there already.

DOE Office of Env. Safety & Health Comment on High-Level Waste Issue Paper.

[redacted]

At 1-2, we concur with the criteria listed for assessment of compliance with the applicable waste criteria, and all of this information should be publicly available at the earliest possible time, and at least in time for a draft comment stage on the NRC's TER for the applicable waste determination. This admonition on the timeliness of the public availability of information should be applied to all the DOE and NRC generated documents and analysis throughout the waste determination process.

At 1-9, we strongly concur with the NRC that prior waste determinations and the information gleaned from those efforts should provide a guide for the agency's review. Importantly, the inventory of radioactive waste disposed of on the site must be factored into the assessment and the modeling of each and every waste determination in cumulative fashion. In addition, the NDAA – along with establishing DOE's waste determination and NRC's concurrent review – required a report from the National Academy of Sciences that was concluded in the spring of 2006. Many of the Academy's conclusions and recommendations either run directly counter to DOE's plans or express significant pessimism that DOE is on the right track with respect to HLW cleanup. As one example, when writing about the estimated doses from the predicted waste residuals in the F Tank Farm at the Savannah River Site, the NAS states:

> In estimating the residual tank inventories for its performance assessment calculations for the T tank farm, DOE assumes that future efforts to clean out tanks will be much more effective than they were for most of the tanks that have already been cleaned out. The committee views this assumption as both optimistic and unsupported. Without a technical basis for the inventory estimates, the committee does not have confidence in the results of the performance assessment for the F Tank Farm.

See NAS Study at 10. Taking into account the full set of directions from Congress, in order for the NRC to make an informed decision on these waste determinations, the NRC must analyze and address whether DOE's plan is in full compliance with the recommendations of the NAS. And if the NRC finds that DOE's plans are not in full compliance with the NAS, it should not recommend going forward with the waste determination.

Comments on incidental waste criteria

At 2-4 (2.4.2), if the definition of highly radioactive is going to be dose-based rather than based on the actual meaning of the words "highly" and "radioactive" *(e.g.*, those radionuclides that have the highest rate of disintegrations), then what contributes significantly to the dose depends on the time of the dose assessment and which radionuclides, if any, are assumed to have been removed prior to that time. To meet the performance objectives of 10 CFR Part 61, there should be no radionuclides that were *not* identified as "highly radioactive" that still may contribute significantly to the dose after all "highly radioactive" radionuclides have been removed to the maximum extent practicable. And this statement should be true over all time periods of assessment.

In 2.4.3, "scheduling" and "programmatic" considerations are not legitimate or lawful bases for avoiding protection of the public health. It is grossly inappropriate to allow DOE to rely on such considerations that are beyond the bounds of the fundamental principles of health physics and one of its basic tenets, the ALARA principle. This is plainly another huge loophole for DOE to abandon in place more dangerous radioactive waste than it would otherwise be required to remove under the law, including the historical interpretation of ALARA.

At 2-5 (2.4.4), the commission should recognize that the Class C limits were derived based on modeling a conventional commercial low-level waste disposal facility. The amounts and concentrations of radionuclides that DOE contemplates leaving on site in tanks and in the saltstone facility far exceed the boundaries of the modeling done for establishing the Class C limits. The NRC must reopen the Class C rulemaking to determine whether these limits should apply to tank and saltstone disposal. Congress did not address these issues when it passed the NDAA and the NRC should do so now.

At 2-5, we agree that with respect to the states covered under the NDAA, the law does not allow for safety requirements that are comparable to 10 CFR Part 61, but rather that waste will be disposed of in compliance with 10 CFR Part 61. However, we disagree, with the NRC's characterization that DOE may implement Order 435.1's waste incidental to reprocessing (WIR) evaluation criteria to reclassify HLW in state's not covered by the NDAA.

Comments on radionuclide removal and concentration limits

At 3-2, the information comprising the areas of review should be available to the public at the earliest possible point in the process, and certainly by the time a draft TER is released.

At 3-5 in the conclusion of review procedures, the SRP should make clear the NRC reviewer should prepare a concise, clear statement of the uncertainties associated with the waste inventory and whether or not DOE has an adequate technical basis for estimating the volume of waste. This comment should be read into the next several sections – including the identification and removal of highly radioactive radionuclides.

At 3-9 and 3-10, we are troubled by the SRP's discussion of removal activities that will not begin until several years after a waste determination has been submitted. DOE should not be submitting waste determinations until such time as it can demonstrably prove that its actions comply with the provisions of the NDAA, including 10 CFR Part 61. To ask the NRC to comment and review hypothetical actions years down the road (and also assess the cumulative effects of a number of related waste reclassifications) is inappropriate and technically indefensible. This section of the SRP should be immediately withdrawn and the NRC should explicitly refuse any request by DOE to make hypothetical conjectures about actions removal and treatment actions that will not occur for several years. This objectionable scenario is again mentioned at 3-11 and should be removed.

At 3-17, the SRP cites the NRC's 1995 branch technical position on concentration averaging (BTP) and fails to mention the NRC's *Draft Interim Concentration Averaging Guidance for Waste Determinations*. 70 Fed. Reg. 74846 (Dec. 16, 2005). We agree with the NRC that the BTP is an inappropriate vehicle to address DOE's WIR determinations. We incorporate here by reference our January 2006 comments on the NRC's *Draft Interim Concentration Averaging Guidance*.

At 3-18, the SRP proposes that:

> Credit can be taken for stabilizing materials added for the purpose of immobilizing the waste (not for stabilizing the contaminated structure) even if it can not be demonstrated that the waste and stabilizing materials are reasonably well-mixed, when the radionuclide concentrations are likely to approach uniformity in the context of applicable intruder scenarios.

Taking credit for things that are not mixed is inappropriate. As we stated in January, average concentration," as DOE uses the term, is not the same as and should not be confused with "actual concentration." Mathematical "averaging," as performed by DOE, does not imply dilution through mixing, and therefore does not imply a reduction in the concentration. Under this SRP, the residual sludge at the bottom of an as yet undefined tank will contain radioisotopes in concentrations that dramatically exceed the Class C limits. As we demonstrated in our January

2006 comments, literally dozens of tanks at the Savannah River Site or at the Hanford site in Washington contain millions of curies in minimal amounts of waste resting in the heels of the tanks. Allowing for mathematical averaging, "taking grout credit," renders meaningless the objective of establishing concentration limits for Class C and other waste categories in 10 CFR 61.55. DOE could just as well average the residual radioactivity in the tanks with arbitrary volumes (or mass) of earth under the tanks or the groundwater adjacent to the tanks. DOE cannot reduce the actual concentration of residual waste by averaging the radioactivity over arbitrary volumes (or masses) of materials with which the wastes are not thoroughly mixed and the NRC should not approve a process for doing so in any venue or any forum.

Comments on performance assessment

With respect to the performance assessment, the NRC should provide the models and all model parameters and assumptions to states and interested members of the public upon request. Many states and public interest groups have the technical ability to perform confirmatory modeling with the advances in computers and associated programs. If there are any licensing issues with provision of such data, then the NRC should work with the interested state or member of the public to appropriately address such licensing issues under applicable law (*i.e.*, provide quick and immediate access to the company that owns the model).

At 4-8, the SRP should be explicit that the buffer zone should in no instance be drawn to allow for dilution of the waste in order to meet regulatory compliance, including compliance with applicable drinking water standards, and in no instance be more than 100 feet from the waste. Additionally, any dose to the public in the buffer zone, including an inadvertent intruder, should not assume institutional controls beyond 100 years.

At 9-4, the SRP discusses public availability of these and other related documents. Again, we reiterate the need for a draft TER, with appropriate time for comment (at least 60-90 days), prior to any set of final conclusions by the NRC on a DOE waste determination.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call us at the number listed below. Thank you very much for your consideration of these matters.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Cochran, Ph.D.

Geoffrey H. Fettus

Mail Envelope Properties (44CE775B.152 : 21 : 33106)

Subject:	NRDC comments on Draft SRP
Creation Date	Mon, Jul 31, 2006 5:34 PM
From:	"Fettus, Geoffrey" <gfettus@nrdc.org>
Created By:	gfettus@nrdc.org

Recipients

nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
NRCREP

nrc.gov
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
[redacted] CC (Anne Bradford)

[redacted]

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	1216	Monday, July 31, 2006 5:34 PM
TEXT.htm	4038	
NRDCcommentsSRP31July2006.pdf	864267	
Mime.822	1190088	

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