

## **Rulemaking1CEm Resource**

---

**From:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 2:11 PM  
**To:** Rulemaking1CEm Resource  
**Cc:** RulemakingComments Resource  
**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Attachments:** 1266 curtis.pdf

**DOCKETED BY USNRC—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
SECY-067**

**PR#:** PR-51  
**FRN#:** 78FR56775  
**NRC DOCKET#:** NRC-2012-0246  
**SECY DOCKET DATE:** 12/20/13  
**TITLE:** Waste Confidence—Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel  
**COMMENT#:** 00847

**Hearing Identifier:** Secy\_RuleMaking\_comments\_Public  
**Email Number:** 883

**Mail Envelope Properties** (377CB97DD54F0F4FAAC7E9FD88BCA6D0014435D730C1)

**Subject:** PR-51 Waste Confidence  
**Sent Date:** 1/6/2014 2:10:42 PM  
**Received Date:** 1/6/2014 2:10:43 PM  
**From:** RulemakingComments Resource

**Created By:** RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"RulemakingComments Resource" <RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Rulemaking1CEM Resource" <Rulemaking1CEM.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	254	1/6/2014 2:10:43 PM
1266 curtis.pdf	219800	

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> January 02, 2014 <b>Received:</b> December 20, 2013 <b>Status:</b> Pending_Post <b>Tracking No.</b> 1jx-89en-66to <b>Comments Due:</b> December 20, 2013 <b>Submission Type:</b> Web
---

**Docket:** NRC-2012-0246

Consideration of Environmental Impacts on Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel After Cessation of Reactor Operation

**Comment On:** NRC-2012-0246-0456

Waste Confidence - Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel; Extension of Comment Period

**Document:** NRC-2012-0246-DRAFT-1266

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-26726

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Daniel Curtis

**Address:**

77 Massachusetts Avenue

Cambridge, MA, 02139

**Email:** djcurtis@mit.edu

---

## General Comment

See attached file(s)

---

## Attachments

Curtis Brinton 2013 Waste Confidence Comment

Select Comments on  
NRC Proposed Rule: Waste Confidence - Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel  
and  
Draft Technical Document: Waste Confidence Generic Environmental Impact Statement  
NUREG-2157

Daniel Curtis, Samuel Brinton  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
[djcurtis@mit.edu](mailto:djcurtis@mit.edu); [sbrinton@mit.edu](mailto:sbrinton@mit.edu)

## Introduction

It was recognized early in the development of civilian nuclear energy that the wastes generated from nuclear power plants and laboratories would require careful storage and disposal. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 defined the framework under which a large federal repository should be developed to permanently store high level waste, and efforts continue to complete this work today. Recent court rulings [1] and Congressional inquiries [2] highlight the importance of finally establishing technically and politically feasible long-term plans for nuclear waste management. Updates to the Waste Confidence Rule play an important role in these long-term plans.

**We support the proposed rule update and implementation of the associated Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS).** We believe it is essential to proceed on schedule with development and implementation of the updated Waste Confidence Rule system, so that applications for licenses for new nuclear power plants may proceed.

NRC proposed plans call for the movement of spent nuclear fuel to dry cask storage systems (DCSS) if storage is necessary for more than 60 years after the end of operating licenses. The long term safety and security of DCSS is therefore essential to the proposed rule system update. The response of new or mildly aged dry casks to a wide range of external events is very well understood [3, 4], and the best available technical analysis and experimental evidence indicate that continued storage of spent nuclear fuel can be made acceptably safe by use of dry cask storage systems and appropriate schedules of inspection, repair, and replacement (SIRR) [5]. **The proposed NRC updates accurately reflect this technical consensus that dry cask storage systems can be used to safely store spent nuclear fuel.**

## Failure to Secure Permanent Storage

The nuclear engineering and geological engineering technical communities are ready to build a repository. Experts surveyed on geologic repositories for spent nuclear fuel demonstrate a consensus that the construction and safe operation of such a repository is completely technically feasible [6, 7]. Many design lessons were learned during the research and development effort at Yucca Mountain, but all issues raised

were resolved before the project was arbitrarily cancelled. The failure of the United States government to provide a permanent storage facility for spent nuclear fuel has been an overwhelmingly political failure, not a technical one.

Considering the political polarization connected with the disposition of spent nuclear fuel, it is essential to employ “Planning-in-Depth”. The goal of Planning-in-Depth is to guarantee the safety and security of the United States inventory of spent nuclear fuel regardless of any possible political developments, or the lack of political developments. Both the former and updated versions of the Waste Confidence rule successfully employ the principle of Planning-in-Depth.

### **Necessary Additional Research**

Many uncertainties in the analysis of dry cask aging and lifetimes remain poorly quantified. The uncertainty on the overall safe lifetime of DCSS in different environments, or with different levels of stored fuel burnup, requires additional research to more effectively quantify. This research could make substantial strides in the short term, given currently available experimental results, technical analysis, and performance data. The results could be used to establish appropriate margins for schedules of inspection, repair, and replacement with greater confidence. Ongoing research is necessary to analyze dry cask system performance data over time and reduce the uncertainties described above. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board has already called for similar research in their recent technical basis evaluation [3].

### **Conclusions**

We support the proposed rule update and implementation of the associated Generic Environmental Impact Statement. The proposed NRC updates accurately reflect the current technical consensus. Deep geologic disposal is technically feasible, but politically difficult, and regulatory planning must account for the overwhelming uncertainty over future political developments. And finally, ongoing research is needed to quantify and reduce the uncertainties associated with the lifetimes of dry cask storage systems.

## REFERENCES

1. United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. *National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners v. United States Department of Energy*. No. 11-1066. (19 November, 2013)
2. United States House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce. Letter to Ernest Moniz, Secretary of Energy. (11 December 2013) Retrieved from <http://energycommerce.house.gov/sites/republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/files/letters/121113%20DOE%20Yucca%20Implementation%20Letter.pdf>
3. United States Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. *Evaluation of the Technical Basis for the Extended Dry Storage and Transportation of Used Nuclear Fuel*. (December 2010) Retrieved from <http://www.nwtrb.gov/reports/eds-final.pdf>
4. Saegusa, Toshiaki et al. *Experimental Studies on Safety of Dry Cask Storage Technology of Spent Fuel: Allowable Temperature of Cladding and Integrity of Cask under Accidents*. (March 1996)
5. American Physical Society Nuclear Energy Study Group. *Consolidated Interim Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel*. (February 2007) Retrieved from <http://www.aps.org/policy/reports/popa-reports/upload/Energy-2007-Report-InterimStorage.pdf>
6. Beckjord, Eric et al. *The Future of Nuclear Power: An Interdisciplinary MIT Study*. (2003)
7. International Atomic Energy Agency. *Scientific and Technical Basis for Geological Disposal of Radioactive Wastes*. IAEA TRS 413. (2003)