

From: <JimWagner@Safe-mail.net>
 To: <NRCREP@nrc.gov>
 Date: Sat, Sep 2, 2006 3:41 PM
 Subject: Comments on 71 FR 130:38675-38676

7/7/06

71 FR 38675

(12)

RECEIVED

2006 SEP - 5 PM 2:12

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

Comments on 71 FR 130:38675-38676
 Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Low-Level Radioactive Waste Program

TO: Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
 US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (US NRC)
 Email: NRCREP@nrc.gov

From: Jim Wagner
 4897 East Walnut Street, Westerville, Ohio 43081

Tuesday, September 2, 2006

The US NRC is reviewing the role, responsibilities and activities of its Low-Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW) regulatory program.

I write because, once again, the questions posed by NRC are directed toward those which the NRC LLRW program has traditionally served, that is, the nuclear industry, the licensees and generators of radioactive waste, rather than the general public which expects radiation protection, to which the NRC should be serving.

I address and try to answer the questions, to the extent I can, but more generally I will reflect what I believe the public expects from NRC with regard to protection from so-called "low-level" radioactive waste.

First of all the definition of "low-level" radioactive waste in the United States includes materials that are not low-risk but high risk.

All radionuclides (some with no upper concentration limit!) are included in the so-called "low-level" category. Some "low-level" radioactive wastes can give a lethal dose in less than an hour. For decades, environmental groups and others have called on NRC to reclassify as higher-level, all radioactive waste that is hazardous longer than the 100 year institutional control period required for "low-level" radioactive waste sites.

Instead, I have found NRC is part of a perilous interagency and international effort to declassify radioactive waste so that it requires less or no institutional and regulatory control.

I oppose these efforts and call on NRC to increase its regulatory control --- not reduce it or facilitate reductions.

I oppose declassification of high level radioactive waste from reprocessing to Waste Incidental to Reprocessing and I oppose a new category of low radioactivity or low activity wastes which could then be removed from licensed regulatory control.

I support classification and regulatory control of long lasting wastes such as depleted uranium in facilities designed for their longevity, not "low-level" waste sites.

I call on NRC to act responsibly regarding nuclear waste materials. NRC's LLRW program should put its efforts and time into increased, not decreased, control of radioactive materials.

Secondly, I oppose risk-informed regulation for both the reactor and materials programs, which NRC adopted, against public will, as part of its strategic rebaselining.

SONSI Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-REDS = ADM-03
 Add = J. Kennedy (SEK1)
 R. White (ARW2)

The simple reason for this opposition is that NRC is denying and not fully evaluating the risks of ionizing radiation at low doses and in combination with other pollutants.

NRC tends to rely on bodies such as the International Commission on Radiological Protection to recommend standards but those bodies admit there are potentially unknown risks and uncertainties but fail to account for them, especially at low doses and dose rates.

NRC and those upon whom it relies to estimate risks have consistently failed to incorporate the uncertainties and known risks to vulnerable parts of the population into its risk assessments.

As a consequence, risks have been and are now, ignored and underestimated.

Sirs: the NRC, its licensees and the radiation hierarchy upon which they rely, should be protecting the public by reducing risks from nuclear exposure, rather than permitting them!

The risk assessments that are done do not have the power or intent to incorporate non-cancer and other health effects or environmental damage. NRC needs a different method of damage analysis for both predictive and retrospective assessments.

A system based on precaution is the only prudent method.

Third, I call on NRC to minimize public exposures and environmental releases of radioactivity from nuclear waste.

The NRC should be working to prevent unnecessary generation of radioactive waste and fully regulate that which is generated.

The NRC should regulate with a goal of keeping track and control.

I don't want risk-informed (de)regulation, I want precaution. Make the NRC goal one of preventing exposures, not setting new, higher, or more "flexible" allowable contamination levels or declassification of wastes to meet lesser protection criteria.

I oppose the deregulation of radioactive wastes, from high to "low" level and from "low" level to unregulated, cleared, released, de minimus or any other category essentially equivalent to below regulatory concern.

I oppose use of NRC staff time and energy on the recategorization of waste to a new "low-activity radioactive waste" class.

I support NRC development of regulations that have a goal of preventing release and exposure rather than legalizing contamination and leakage.

During the many years of siting for new "low-level" radioactive waste dumps across the country there was a common message that NRC never seemed to hear --- the need to isolate and re-containerize. Today 10 CFR 61 still allows unlined soil trench burial of radioactive wastes and leakage from the licensed burial sites. NRC efforts should be expended to tighten up on these weaknesses in the existing regulations.

Numerous states have prohibited shallow land burial, some even requiring above ground storage. I support continued state authority for greater protection and encourage NRC to strengthen its "low-level" waste management and disposal requirements. As long as licensed sites are permitted to leak and emit radioactivity, it will be difficult to garner public support for them. Yet it is arguably worse to send radioactive waste to unlicensed sites, where there is no expectation by the public of receiving a dose. I oppose this use of staff time.

Should NRC expend its resources licensing new sites and facilities, regulating or assisting agreement states in regulating and expanding existing ones, or facilitating alternative management of radioactive waste?

Any answers to this question, when carried out in the absence of due concern and care for the health effects of exposure to ionizing radiation, is irresponsible and dangerous.

"Creative" options for managing nuclear waste, such as the use or misuse 10 CFR 20.2002 to deregulate nuclear waste will lead to more public exposures and in some cases, creation of more mixed radioactive and hazardous waste. For example, sending nuclear waste from decommissioning to hazardous waste sites, especially in the absence of sound scientific knowledge about the synergistic effects of radioactive and hazardous wastes is completely irresponsible.

I want the NRC LLRW program to strengthen the requirements isolation of radioactive materials and wastes at licensed radioactive waste facilities.

The NRC LLRW program should require and provide transparent routine reporting of waste generated at each site and its storage, disposal and final destination.

While NRC perceives its mission is to:

"ensure a stable, reliable and adaptable regulatory framework for effective LLRW management while also considering future needs and changes that may occur in the nation's commercial LLW management system."

I must add to this that the NRC mission should be to protect the public and to prevent exposure to radioactive waste.

Instead of spending its time calculating allowable doses to the public from licensed sites and from the release of nuclear waste from licensed control, the NRC should be actively protecting the public.

Even worse are NRC's efforts and tendency toward generically deregulating radioactive waste and materials.

I am glad that action on the proposed rule that would have generically deregulated nuclear waste has been postponed, and I write to advocate complete and permanent rejection of it.

Thank you for considering my comments.

CC: <ginwagner@safe-mail.net>, <JimWagner@safe-mail.net>

Mail Envelope Properties (44F9DE3F.4DE : 2 : 46302)**Subject:** Comments on 71 FR 130:38675-38676**Creation Date** Sat, Sep 2, 2006 3:40 PM**From:** <JimWagner@Safe-mail.net>**Created By:** JimWagner@Safe-mail.net**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

NRCREP

safe-mail.net

ginwagner CC

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

safe-mail.net

Files

MESSAGE

Mime.822

Size

7968

9998

Date & Time

Saturday, September 2, 2006 3:40 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