

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 10 CFR Part 61 Rulemaking and
Implementation of the Concentration
Averaging and Encapsulation BTP
Public Meeting

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Phoenix, Arizona

Date: Friday, March 20, 2015

Work Order No.: NRC-1438

Pages 1-126

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL SAFETY AND SAFEGUARDS

+ + + + +

10 CFR PART 61 RULEMAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
CONCENTRATION AVERAGING AND ENCAPSULATION BTP

+ + + + +

FRIDAY,

MARCH 20, 2015

+ + + + +

The public meeting convened in the Renaissance Phoenix Downtown Hotel, 50 East Adams Street, Phoenix, Arizona, at 8:00 a.m., Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

LARRY CAMPER, NMSS

STEPHEN DEMBEK, NMSS

DAVID ESH, NMSS

GREGORY SUBER, NMSS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Facilitator Opening Comments, C. Cameron.....	3
NRC Welcome, Larry Camper.....	6
Discussion of Rulemaking Process and Comment	
Process, S. Dembek.....	10
Overview of Part 61 Proposed Rule, D. Esh.....	24
Facilitated Public Discussion, C. Cameron and	
NRC Staff.....	46
Implementation Plan for the Branch Technical	
Position on Concentration Averaging,	
G. Suber.....	96
Closing Remarks, L. Camper.....	116
Adjourn	

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P R O C E E D I N G S

(8:35 a.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good morning, everyone.

And good morning to all of you out there on the phones and on the web also.

My name is Chip Cameron and I'd like to welcome you to today's public meeting. And our topic today is a couple of things on low-level waste. There is a proposed rule. I mean it's rumored that there's a proposed rule from the NRC amending Part 61. And that's going to be our main topic, but we're also going to talk about the Branch Technical position also. And it's a pleasure for me to see all of you and to serve as your facilitator for the meeting today and in that role I just want to try to help all of you have a productive meeting.

And I'd like to just cover some meeting process issues with you so that you know what to expect today. And I'd like to talk about the objectives of the meeting, the format for the meeting, some simple ground rules to follow and just briefly go over the agenda and introduce the NRC speakers.

In terms of objectives, the first objective is for the NRC to provide you with clear information about what's in the proposed rule and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 what's in the Branch Technical position and I think that
2 in going over the proposed rule, if there's any gloss,
3 so to speak, that's in the Reg. Guide, Regulatory Guide,
4 on the proposed rule we will also go into that. And
5 the second objective is to give you an opportunity to
6 ask questions and make comments.

7 In terms of format, we're going to have
8 some NRC presentations and then we're going to go out
9 to all of you for questions and comment and we'll also
10 be going to people on the phone and maybe getting
11 questions over the web that we'll talk about.

12 Now I should emphasize that the meeting is
13 being transcribed. We have Peggy Schuerger right here
14 who is our court reporter. She's making a transcript
15 of the meeting and that's going to be the NRC's record
16 of the meeting and your record of the meeting. But I
17 want to emphasize that any comments you make today,
18 they're not going to be considered as formal comments
19 on the proposed rule. You'll have to submit written
20 comments on that and I think that Steve Dembek from the
21 NRC staff is probably going to talk about how that
22 works.

23 One good thing about not having formal
24 comments today is that it might give us a chance to have
25 a dialogue on the issues. For example, if Tom

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Magette says something very provocative, we might want
2 to get other people's reactions to that. So we'll do
3 that today.

4 Ground rules, I would just ask you to wait
5 until the particular presentation is complete before
6 asking questions or making comments. And when we get
7 to the discussion periods, if you could just signal me
8 and I'll bring you this cordless mic, or if you want
9 you can come up here to this microphone also. Then
10 we'll see if we can answer your questions. I would just
11 ask that only one person speak at a time for two very
12 important reasons. One, so that we can give our full
13 attention to whomever has the floor, but also so that
14 we can get what I call a clean transcript so that Peggy
15 will know who is speaking. And I would ask you to every
16 time you talk, if you could just introduce yourself.
17 And that goes for people on the phone, too. I would
18 ask you to try to be brief. I think we have plenty of
19 time today, but I want to make sure that we can get to
20 everyone.

21 And what I thought we'd do is I like to give
22 everybody one chance to make a comment and ask a
23 question and then we'll circle back if anybody has other
24 things to say. And we will go to the people on the
25 phone. Our operator is Yomi and she is going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 establish the queue, so to speak, for people on the
2 phone to ask their questions. So we'll be going back
3 and forth.

4 In terms of the agenda, we're going to have
5 a welcome from Larry Camper, who is the Director of the
6 Division of Decommissioning, Uranium Recovery, and
7 Waste Programs. And then we're going to hear from
8 Steve Dembek, NRC staff, who is going to talk about the
9 rulemaking process. And then we're going to go to
10 David Esh who is going to talk about the substantive
11 aspects of the proposed rule. We'll take a break at
12 9:45. We'll come back for discussion. And then we'll
13 spend a short amount of time, shorter, I should say,
14 on the implementation plan for the Branch Technical
15 position, and hopefully, we'll be done at 12:30. And
16 Larry is the senior NRC official here today and I'll
17 ask him to close the meeting out for us at the end.

18 So with that, Larry, do you want to make
19 some comments? All right.

20 MR. CAMPER: Good morning. Welcome. It
21 is very enjoyable to see such a great turnout and to
22 see a lot of colleagues and friends and appreciate your
23 staying around following the Symposium. We've done
24 this now for the last four or five years and most of
25 you turn out. It's very important and primarily we had

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 industry practitioners. It's a good opportunity to
2 get that perspective in particular, as well as the
3 public views that will come along today.

4 We have a proposed rule. Pardon me if I
5 wax about this for a minute. And when I think about
6 this rulemaking, I must thank the staff, Mr. Suber, and
7 his staff in particular. Others are here somewhere.
8 But I also must thank many of you. Along the way, we
9 use a stronger process. When I say stronger, I mean
10 beyond the requirements of the rulemaking process in
11 terms of getting information out. We provided the
12 staff's language a couple of times. We had several
13 meetings. We got three rounds of direction from the
14 Commission along the way. So it's really been quite
15 a process.

16 I think back to the fact that this all
17 started, seriously, in 2005 as a result of the
18 adjudicatory proceedings associated with the RES
19 application and the subsequent direction through our
20 staff to outside of the adjudicatory process to
21 determine if our regulation needed to be modified to
22 address the disposal of large quantities of depleted
23 uranium. And so in 2008, the staff developed a SECY
24 08-0147 and in that we did an analysis and we
25 recommended to the Commission that yes, we did need to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 modify our regulations. And we proposed that that
2 modification would be to require in Part 61 a site
3 specific performance assessment that would address the
4 disposal of large quantities of depleted uranium and
5 other long-lived isotopes that weren't directly
6 analyzed at the time Part 61 went into effect some 30
7 years.

8 Well, along the way, we got a lot of very
9 good input. I look around the room, I see friends and
10 colleagues who were at a number of these meetings and
11 provided very, very good input. And you helped the
12 process immensely. You aided the staff in developing
13 what we believe is a good regulation. And today, when
14 Dr. Esh goes through and shows you the most important
15 contents of the rule, you'll see that I think we've done
16 a very good job of addressing the disposal of depleted
17 uranium. We've enhanced the use of the waste
18 acceptance criteria. And when you see what the
19 Commission directed us to do, you didn't think about
20 protection component holistically. There are three
21 phrases to it as you will see, three major parts to it.
22 But think of it holistically. And as you read the rule
23 in the weeks to come and you provide us comments, we
24 would greatly appreciate your thoughts on the approach.
25 There's a few items in there like the level of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 compatibility that's been assigned, Compatibility B
2 that you'll hear about. So we're looking for some good
3 feedback on the proposed rule.

4 I wish that we had it in the FRN, as Chip
5 pointed out in this comments. Today, this is for
6 discussion. It is in the ADAMS. Steve will give you
7 the citation for the ADAMS. It will be in an FRN on
8 Monday, the 23rd. That's when the formal comment
9 period actually begins, so we encourage you to provide
10 your written comments. But I think the value of today,
11 even though the formal comment period starts on Monday,
12 I think the value today is we're going to have a
13 discussion. You're going to see the essence of the key
14 changes in the rule. And your comments today and the
15 discussion that we have will be of great value to the
16 staff when we go back because we're going to have more
17 public meetings about this rulemaking.

18 So we'll hear things today that we can then
19 factor into considerations of our discussions in future
20 meetings. There will one or more public meetings. In
21 fact, there will probably -- I think Greg, you'll talk
22 more about that. There will be several public
23 meetings. And so today does form an opportunity to
24 help us congeal and form the kinds of dialogue that will
25 take place in these upcoming public meetings.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So with that, again, I thank you for being
2 here. It's a great turnout and I appreciate your
3 staying around to help us out today and we do look
4 forward to your comments and having a very useful
5 discussion. Thank you for being here.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Larry. And
7 we're going to have Steve Dembek talk about the
8 rulemaking process. But I neglected to introduce
9 Gregory Suber who is going to talk about the Branch
10 Technical position. He's the Chief of the Low-Level
11 Waste Branch in Larry's division. Here's Steve
12 Dembek.

13 MR. DEMBEK: Thank you, Chip. Can
14 everyone hear me okay? Yes, thank you. Okay. Yes,
15 as Chip mentioned, my name is Steve Dembek. I am in
16 the Low-Level Waste Branch. I work for Gregory Suber
17 and you can see the rest of my -- where I work here.
18 I'm part of NMSS. Let's see.

19 Go on to the next slide. All right. It's
20 working.

21 This morning I plan to go over the key
22 aspects of the rulemaking process for the Part 61
23 proposed rule. Later on, as Chip mentioned, Dave Esh
24 will provide specifics about the technical content of
25 the proposed rule itself.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I plan to explain why we do rulemakings,
2 what the objective is for this particular proposed
3 rulemaking that we have worked on, the status and time
4 line which you all are probably interested in for the
5 rule and how to submit comments on the proposed rule.

6 I also will cover the time line and comment
7 on the process for the regulatory guidance that comes
8 with the rule, that is actually a slightly different
9 process than the comment process for the proposed rule
10 itself. So I'll get into all the differences there.

11 Now getting into the why, why do we do
12 rulemaking, this is a pretty general discussion, but
13 it won't take that long. Rulemaking is one way in which
14 the Commission's policy is implemented. Long term, it
15 is Commission policy to regulate through the
16 development of rules and not to regulate by using orders
17 or license conditions. Rulemaking makes requirements
18 generally applicable to everyone, whereas an order or
19 license condition only applies to the entity getting
20 the order or licensee condition.

21 Rulemaking, this is an important
22 distinction, rulemaking is also a very public process.
23 Rulemaking provides opportunity for stakeholders, like
24 you, to get involved and we provide you a period of time
25 to comment on the proposed wording in the rule and you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 can certainly submit any comments you like. And it is
2 through a public process. You have to keep in mind all
3 the comments you submit and all the comments you receive
4 will be made publicly available so that everyone can
5 look at those comments.

6 In developing a proposed rule, we consider
7 recent research, lessons learned from implementation
8 of the existing rules, issues identified during
9 inspections, existing facilities, a recommendation
10 from advisory bodies, information included in any
11 petitions for rulemaking. We also consider
12 stakeholder comments that we receive throughout the
13 rulemaking process and we also consider comments we
14 receive after we issue a proposed rule for comment which
15 is basically the step we're in now. We're going to be
16 issuing a proposed rule for your comment and you're
17 welcome to comment on it. And all of these aspects are
18 considered in the development of the proposed rule
19 language.

20 As far as the objective for this particular
21 rule, why do we do this particular rulemaking? Larry,
22 of course, touched on it a bit, but the objective of
23 the proposed 10 CFR Part 61 revisions is to require
24 low-level waste disposal licensees or license
25 applicants to ensure the same disposal of any low-level

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 waste streams that are significantly different from the
2 low-level waste streams that were considered in the
3 current 10 CFR Part 61 regulations.

4 And as I stated before, Dave will be
5 getting into some of these, the details of what are
6 these different technical differences between the
7 current rule and the proposed rule.

8 Now here's the time line. This is what a
9 lot of you are interested in, I'm sure. I just had to
10 change this slide today because some of this
11 information we just got a few hours ago. The rule
12 that's going to be published, Larry mentioned March
13 23rd. The latest information I heard was March 26th.
14 March 26th, the rule is supposed to published in the
15 Federal Register and that ML number, the ADAMS
16 accession number written at the top of the page there
17 is the number of the drafted proposed rule. The
18 Federal Register people made a few minor editorial
19 changes to our rule so it's not going to look exactly
20 the same as the one the Federal Register notice is
21 issued, but the content of it, the technical aspects
22 of it, it's going to be -- you'll find it right there
23 in the draft proposed rule.

24 And so in order to support today's meeting,
25 the draft was issued on Wednesday. I don't know if some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of you had a chance to look at that yet or not. It was
2 announced in the meeting announcement -- it was added
3 to the meeting announcement, but a lot of this stuff
4 was happening at the last minute due to the issues I
5 just explained about working with the Federal Register
6 people.

7 And we're going to accept comments 120 days
8 from the date of publication. According to the Federal
9 Register people, this is another one of the slides that
10 just changed, that close date is July 24, 2014. So
11 that's the 120-day period. You have got to have your
12 comments into us by then.

13 Going on from there, the final rule is
14 expected to be sent to the Commission for review and
15 approval approximately 12 months after the comment
16 period closes. But the exact timing will, of course,
17 be based on the number and the complexity of the
18 comments we receive and may also change to reflect and
19 extension of the public comment period if one is
20 necessary.

21 If you do comment, the more clearly you
22 state your concern and any supporting information you
23 can provide with your comment will make the whole
24 process a lot more efficient, so we can get things done
25 quickly. Now presuming the process stays on schedule,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we would expect a final rule to be sent to the Commission
2 in the July time frame of 2016. And the final rule
3 would likely be published in the Federal Register in
4 the late summer or fall of 2016. Remember, that's
5 assuming everything goes as scheduled. This is just
6 to give you a rough idea of the process going forward.

7 And the final rule will be effective one
8 year after it is published in the Federal Register.
9 And it will apply to any licensee or applicant in a
10 non-agreement state. If you are licensed by an
11 agreement state, the agreement states will have three
12 years to develop compatible regulations. So for many
13 of you, it may be close to the year 2020 before you
14 actually have to go by the new provisions listed in the
15 proposed rulemaking.

16 Now I'm going to go into the submittal
17 process. This came right from the Federal Register
18 notice. I'm not going to go through all the methods
19 in detail. You can get those in the Federal Register
20 notice and in the draft Federal Register notice which
21 again was issued on Wednesday and is available through
22 our website. But I do want to point out some specific
23 facts that are very important. The first is that the
24 top bullet there, the docket number is very important.
25 Obviously, each proposed rulemaking has its own docket

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 number. You've got to put the correct docket number
2 on and then I'm not going to go in detail on these, but
3 I just want to mention there are five different ways
4 you can give us your comments. The Federal Government
5 has a rulemaking website at www.regulations.gov. As
6 long as you put in that correct docket number, you can
7 submit a comment there. You can mail comments to us.

8 You can email comments to us. If you're
9 on the Rockville Pike, you can hand deliver comments
10 to us between 7:30 and 4:15 on federal work days. And
11 also you can fax your comments to us. So we have quite
12 a few ways. We try to be as flexible as possible, quite
13 a few ways for you to get comments to us on the proposed
14 rule wording. Remember, I'm talking now about the
15 proposed rule wording. I'll talk later about how to
16 comment on the guidance document.

17 You are encouraged to submit formal
18 comments for the record, using the methods discussed
19 on this slide. As a reminder, since the rulemaking
20 process is a public process, the comments we receive
21 will be made publicly available. Again, if you choose
22 to provide comments, it is more helpful if you explain
23 why a provision is a problem, rather than if you just
24 note you are opposed to something in the proposed rule.

25 Okay, now I'll shift and talk about the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guidance document. You see it's called Draft
2 NUREG-2175. It is titled "Guidance for Conducting
3 Technical Analyses for 10 CFR Part 61." And this has
4 also been issued for public comment. This is also
5 available on the website. It was available at that
6 accession number there. It was available late in the
7 day on Wednesday also. This is a very large document.

8 Dave, could you hold up the -- so that's
9 the draft NUREG for your comment. It's a very large
10 document. Obviously, we're not going to pass them out
11 today, but it is available for downloading on the
12 website.

13 And the Federal Register notice formally
14 requesting comments on the guidance document will be
15 issued the same day on March 26th and it will have the
16 same end period, July 24, 2015. Same 120-day period.

17 I encourage you to look at the guidance
18 document and provide comments on it. We expect to
19 finalize the guidance document and publish it when the
20 final rule is published which again, we're shooting for
21 with the current schedule late summer of 2016 or maybe
22 the fall of 2016, around that time frame.

23 So I mentioned previously that the comment
24 submittal process for the guidance is different than
25 the comment submittal for the proposed rule. Here is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 an outline of what's different.

2 First of all, you see the first bullet, the
3 docket number is different. We have a different docket
4 number, but you can go to the federal rulemaking website
5 at www.regulations.gov and as long as you put this
6 docket number in, you can comment on the guidance. And
7 you can mail comments in. So we don't have any many
8 options for the guidance document. You can mail
9 comments in and it's a different mail address. This
10 goes to our Office of Administration. The rule
11 comments go into our Office of the Secretary at the NRC.

12 Comments on the guidance are very
13 important to us. It tells us where we need to provide
14 additional information or clarify the information that
15 we have provided. Comments on the guidance can also
16 result in clarifying of the rule language itself.
17 Again, I encourage you to submit written comments using
18 either of the two methods show on this slide. And the
19 formal period for submitting comments will start on
20 March 26th when the Federal Register notice is issued.
21 But you're welcome to look at this ahead of time.

22 And last, I have my contact information up
23 on the slide. I also have Gary Comfort's contact
24 information on this slide. I'm a project manager with
25 overall Part 61 responsibilities, but Gary Comfort,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 he's got more rulemaking experience. If I can't answer
2 a question or if you think of a question later, you could
3 either send it to me, Gary, or both of us and ask
4 questions. But for right now, I'll stop and if you have
5 any specific questions on the rulemaking process or the
6 comment process, let me know.

7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Steve.
8 Any questions on process before we get into the
9 substance of the rule? Does anybody have a process
10 question?

11 And Dan, please introduce yourself so that
12 Peggy can get that on the transcript here.

13 MR. SHRUM: Thanks, Steve, for your
14 presentation. My name is Dan Shrum with Energy
15 Solutions. I may have missed it and I don't think Chip
16 said it either, but when will be the public meetings
17 be held? Are you scheduling those? Do you have
18 approximate dates and approximate locations?

19 MR. DEMBEK: We don't have those dates
20 yet. We will have some public meetings, but we don't
21 have the dates yet. This was -- it took us time to get
22 the rule out and now that we've got the rule out now
23 we can decide on when we're going to have those
24 meetings.

25 MR. SUBER: I can add a little bit more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information. This is Gregory Suber. Now we're going
2 to have regional meetings when we do Part 61 and so we
3 don't have the dates and we haven't solidified them yet,
4 but we'll do something probably in the Salt Lake City
5 area, likely go to Region IV or the Texas area and also
6 South Carolina.

7 MR. CAMERON: And just one clarification,
8 too, for Steve or for Gregory. Will the public
9 meetings be done after the rule comment period closes
10 or during the period? If you could give people just
11 an idea of when that might occur.

12 MR. SUBER: The public meetings will
13 probably be during the public --

14 MR. CAMERON: During the comment. Okay.
15 So some time before July 24th, I guess.

16 Dan, do you have a follow up on this?

17 MR. DEMBEK: I think it will be --

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, that's fine. But we
19 need to get everybody on the mic.

20 MR. SHRUM: Dan Shrum again with Energy
21 Solutions. You've separated the rule from the
22 guidance document. Will these public meetings be the
23 same meeting or are you going to have rules for Part
24 61, the rule and the guidance?

25 MR. DEMBEK: They'll be the same meeting.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The only reason it's separated is because two different
2 offices at the NRC control the two different documents.
3 The rules are all controlled by our Office of the
4 Secretary. And this guidance document is controlled
5 by our Office of Administration. That's the only
6 reason why they are separate. Otherwise, we would have
7 them the same. So when we have the meetings, they're
8 all going to be -- we'll talk about it all together.
9 They're intended to go together. The guidance is
10 intended to go with the rule so it wouldn't make sense
11 to have to separate that out just because of two
12 different offices that the NRC are controlling who gets
13 the comments.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's go to the phones
15 and then we'll come back here in the room.

16 Yomi, does anybody -- is there anybody on
17 the phone who has a question about rulemaking process?

18 OPERATOR: I'm showing no questions.
19 Thank you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Tomi. John.

21 MR. GREEVES: John Greeves. Steve, the
22 last time we went through this, the staff provided a
23 redline strikeout of -- I don't know what you called
24 it, but the draft at the time. So I know the record
25 is not open, but I want to request -- is this mic on?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'll get closer.

2 So I'll request now and I'll do it again
3 when the record opens, but the staff helped us a lot
4 by giving us a redline strikeout version of the rule.
5 So I'm requesting that you provide a redline strikeout
6 version of the rule so we can see. The version of the
7 rule we've been working with for decades, what did you
8 do with it in terms of what was struck out and what are
9 the new inserts? It really helps us focus our
10 comments. So thank you for doing it the last time and
11 I request it now and I'll do it again when the record
12 opens us. Do you understand?

13 MR. DEMBEK: I understand that. And the
14 comment requesting redline strikeout version, we'll do
15 that. I'm not sure exactly how that's going to get
16 done, whether the staff has to do that ourselves and
17 put it in ADAMS as a separate document, or how that
18 exactly works. But I'm sure we'll be able to do it.

19 MR. GREEVES: You did it last time, so I
20 thank you for that. Just ask you to repeat it so we
21 can be very clear on what the changes were. Thank you
22 so much.

23 Mr. <Carter.= Thank you, John. And
24 everybody will just have to speak into the mic so that
25 we can get it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CURILLI: John Curilli. The question
2 I have, if comments on the rule are going to one place
3 and comments on the guidance are going to another, how
4 are you going to ensure that those two documents match
5 up and agree with one another?

6 MR. DEMBEK: The comments on the rule and
7 the comments on the -- and the guidance, they go to
8 administrative organizations, basically, at the NRC.
9 Those administrative organizations at the NRC, the
10 Office of the Secretary and the Office of
11 Administration, will give those comments all to us. So
12 the technical people are going to get all those comments
13 and we'll make sure that they are considered
14 appropriately and we'll make sure that they are
15 coordinated. Does that answer your question?

16 MR. CURILLI: Yes, it does.

17 MR. DEMBEK: Okay.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's go to the
19 substance of the soon to be issued proposed rule and
20 thank you very much, Steve. Now we have Dr. Dave Esh.

21 MR. ESH: Thank you. I'm going to give
22 you an overview of maybe the substance of the rule and
23 the guidance document. And as we talked about or was
24 talked about, these two things go together. The rule,
25 of course, supplies the requirements that you must meet

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the guidance supplies the staff -- methods that the
2 staff would find acceptable for meeting those
3 requirements.

4 So an integration of the two, but the
5 guidance -- you can take different approaches to
6 guidance than what the staff proposes. So if you're
7 in an agreement state, the agreement state regulators
8 may find other methods acceptable within their
9 agreement state to satisfy the regulatory
10 requirements. So keep that in mind as I go through
11 this.

12 I realize this meeting overlaps with
13 National Collegiate Association events, so if any of
14 you yell out yes when I put a flow sheet up, I'll know
15 you're probably busted.

16 So the topic I'm going to cover, as Larry
17 had said in his introduction, these are kind of the key
18 topics that I'm going to cover, analysis, time frames,
19 the performance assessment, the intruder assessment,
20 the safety case/defense-in-depth and waste acceptance
21 criteria.

22 And then I'm going to through the guidance
23 document giving you just a brief overview of it because
24 it is a pretty large document and then some select
25 examples for what is in it. I'm not going to cover all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 topics. There's no rule text in here, so you're going
2 to have to go to the links that Stephen provided to see
3 that information. But this is intended to give you the
4 context of what we're trying to do so that you can see
5 the forest and then you might have a lot of comments
6 on the trees, but you can kind of see how everything
7 fits together, what we were trying to do.

8 So first topic, analysis time frames. On
9 the right here, your left, my right, is the proposed
10 approach that we initially sent to the Commission and
11 then on the other side is what you will see now in the
12 packages that you review. So initially, we had a
13 two-tiered approach with a 10,000 year compliance
14 period followed by a performance period. The hashed
15 area at the top for the performance period, that was
16 only applicable if you have sufficient amounts of
17 long-lived waste. So basically you only had a
18 one-tiered analysis if you didn't have long-lived
19 waste. If you had a lot of long-lived waste, you were
20 going to be doing this two-tiered approach.

21 And down at the bottom it shows the
22 different performance objectives, the protection of
23 the general population and then the protection of the
24 inadvertent intruder.

25 What you will find now is we have a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 three-tiered approach based on the Commission
2 direction where that initial period that was a 10,000
3 year compliance period is broken into two tiers. So
4 we have a 1,000 year compliance period, followed by this
5 protective assurance period. And they have different
6 objectives, but they both fit together. And then you
7 have the same performance period at the long term if
8 you have sufficient quantities of long-lived waste.

9 And down on the far side there, you'll see
10 it says increasing uncertainty, flexibility to
11 licensees and decision makers. So what we were trying
12 to achieve is during the process, we got a lot of
13 comments about uncertainty and how you do this and what
14 does the information mean and how you should use it.
15 And so we wanted to try to have something that afforded
16 some flexibilities for people to represent or to
17 consider those different opinions.

18 And so this approach, I think, does that
19 because of especially the second two tiers. They are
20 more of a minimization or optimization process and less
21 of a strict here's a number that you must meet process.
22 So it affords some flexibility to kind of go about why
23 you think your facility can meet the criteria or how
24 you're going to meet the criteria.
25 Anyway, that's the context for the analysis time

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 frames. I know it was a topic that had a lot of
2 discussion.

3 So then one of the key elements is the
4 performance assessment. The performance assessment
5 is not necessarily a new thing. It's a new
6 terminology, more so in our minds. So an original Part
7 61, you had to do technical analyses and that technical
8 analyses we think is very comparable to a performance
9 assessment with some differences. Around the outside
10 of this diagram, we provide the different rule areas
11 that we've modified related to performance assessment,
12 so you can see you have to update the performance
13 assessment at closure. That's more of a bookkeeping
14 thing.

15 We have the new WAC approach which I'm
16 going to talk about, waste acceptance criteria, which
17 allows you to develop waste acceptance criteria. And
18 then either use the Part 61 waste classification tables
19 or the results of your analysis basically.

20 We added something in 61.13 regarding
21 features, events, and processes. That's important to
22 get the scope right for your analysis, especially when
23 you're disposing of long-lived waste. So can you sit
24 down with a few people and get the scope right when
25 you're disposing of traditional low-level waste that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 has very short-lived activity and all decays away
2 fairly rapidly. That's a lot easier. When you have
3 long-lived waste and you have to worry about some other
4 processes, it's harder to get the scope right. So
5 there's a requirement in there now about features,
6 events, and processes.

7 And then in the guidance document, there's
8 an awful lot of information about the FEP process only
9 because the features, events, and process is kind of
10 cumbersome. There's not an easy way to do it, but you
11 can either do it top down or bottom up approach and
12 either one, you have to do quite a bit of evaluation
13 to ensure you get the scope right for your analysis.

14 We added something in 61.13 also about the
15 explicit consideration of uncertainty and variability
16 that wasn't really mentioned -- or isn't mentioned in
17 the existing -- the previous version of Part 61, but
18 it is now. And then over on the side here also on 61.13,
19 something that's very important is to provide model
20 support and consideration of alternative conceptual
21 models. So this isn't -- granted, you can't do
22 modeling as a traditional model because you can't do
23 validation over these time frames. You don't know what
24 the result is going to be in the future. You're doing
25 a projection. But that's why we call it model support,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not model validation. You do have to provide support
2 for your calculations, why they're reasonable, why you
3 think they're a good representation of the future and
4 that projection is relatively correct. So that was
5 added in 61.13.

6 These are all just enhancements to the
7 technical analysis and to the performance assessment.
8 I'll talk about defense-in-depth in another slide.
9 And then we also had to modify 61.50 as a result of the
10 long-lived waste requirements and I'll talk a little
11 bit about that, too.

12 So intruder assessment. There's a flow
13 sheet on the side here and I see that this -- because
14 we had a problem with the slides when we started here
15 and we copied this over, there's an error in that bottom
16 bubble there. It should say "complies with 61.42."
17 It's correct in the guidance document. This is a flow
18 sheet from the guidance document. It was corrected on
19 the slides, but then we changed the slides out at the
20 last minute.

21 Anyway, the intruder assessment is
22 probably the only thing that really absolutely needed
23 to be changed in response to SECY 08-147. In the
24 current regulation, not the proposed one, the current
25 regulation, the protection of the intruder was based

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on basically NRC's analysis that was used to developed
2 the waste classification tables. Sure you had to
3 provide information about intruder barriers and
4 segregating different type of waste or meet a minimum
5 depth requirement for -- but that was the extent. You
6 didn't have to do any sort of dose analysis for
7 intruders. But when you disposed of or wanted to
8 dispose of large quantities of depleted uranium,
9 uranium is not in the waste classification table, so
10 what amount of uranium can you safely dispose of?
11 Well, it's not part of the waste classification table,
12 so therefore somebody needed to do an analysis to say
13 what's appropriate.

14 NRC, one of the options we considered was
15 we'd just revise the waste classification tables and
16 put uranium numbers in there. The problem with that
17 and the problem with the waste classification tables
18 in general is it's done for one particular site with
19 particular environmental conditions that has embedded
20 assumptions in it, that may not be appropriate for your
21 site and they may even be widely in error for your site
22 in both a conservative and a non-conservative
23 direction. So allowing licensees to do an analysis for
24 the intruders or requiring them to do an analysis for
25 the intruders is a smarter process because you can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 better reflect what's going on at your site.

2 So what this looks like is it's going to
3 be very similar to what was done by the NRC to develop
4 Part 61 in the early 1980s. You are required to do an
5 intruder analysis. You're going to use intrusion
6 scenarios, language is here, that are realistic and
7 consistent with expected activities and in and around
8 the disposal site at the time of site closure and apply
9 a dose limit of 500 millirem for that analyses.

10 So now we'll move on to safety case and
11 defense-in-depth. The proposed rule includes a
12 discussion of safety case and defense-in-depth
13 protections. The diagram there on the side kind of
14 gives you the context for how it fits together, so in
15 existing Part 61, not the proposed, we kind of felt like
16 safety case was all about what Part 61 was doing. It's
17 your whole licensing process was your safety case. It
18 wasn't explicit in calling that out and saying safety
19 case like it's done in the international vernacular
20 now. But it was part of it. So we added a little bit
21 to explicitly state safety case in the regulation, but
22 we're not defining safety case sufficiently different
23 than the licensing basis that you may have used for
24 those that are either licensees or agreement state
25 regulators for your existing facilities. But we do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 explain how the combination of defense-in-depth and
2 performance assessment should be used to support the
3 licensing decision.

4 The addition here is the defense-in-depth
5 process that I'll talk about and we have some things
6 on the side, site ownership and stability in the natural
7 characteristics, imposing concentration limits, which
8 are based on how you estimate your system is going to
9 behave. The use of barriers and the waste acceptance
10 criteria should really be on the other side. This is
11 another issue in changing these slides out. But on the
12 other side we have the performance assessment and
13 intruder assessment and long term analyses,
14 defense-in-depth and the stability analyses. So they
15 all kind of are different technical analyses.

16 So the combination of the technical
17 analyses and these defense-in-depth components mesh
18 together to give you your safety case. And the only
19 really, I'd say, new things are the intruder analyses
20 or the intruder assessment and the defense-in-depth
21 which might be depending on the approach you take, it
22 could be a different type of analyses or it could just
23 be kind of a qualitative argument as to how your
24 elements in your system provide defense-in-depth.

25 Defense-in-depth though could be an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 additional challenge and that's one thing we'd like to
2 hear your comments on in this proposed rule because we
3 looked at this very carefully and NRC has some language
4 that defines defense-in-depth that's basically you
5 can't really -- you need independent and redundant
6 barriers and you can't exclusively rely on any one
7 barrier. It's used to account for uncertainty in your
8 systems so that redundancy and independence might be
9 a challenge, not, I think, for the short term because
10 you can easily make an argument of all the things that
11 the regulation requires of you, provides
12 defense-in-depth and your analysis for the short term.
13 But for the longer term, you start facing challenges
14 with arguing for the longevity of some of those
15 protections. So that may be a bit of a challenge and
16 that's an area we want to definitely get your comments
17 on.

18 So waste acceptance criteria, on Slide 7
19 here, you have a new approach now. The waste
20 acceptance criteria, which is used by the Department
21 of Energy and internationally, is basically developing
22 the characteristics and criteria for your waste that
23 are going to allow your system to meet the requirements.
24 And it's primarily an analysis-based approach,
25 although a lot of it might be more qualitative, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't want to put -- without even an analysis, you can
2 say well, I don't want to put material in a system that's
3 flammable or pyrophoric. There's various things you
4 can come up with. You don't have to do an analysis to
5 know that's a bad idea. But there are many other
6 characteristics that you may use your analysis to
7 define well, what is it can I accept? What specific
8 concentrations of various isotopes are appropriate for
9 my system?

10 So the analysis helps define the waste
11 acceptance criteria and in what we've proposed it's an
12 "or" approach. So you can still use the 61.55 waste
13 classification system if you don't want to worry with
14 the concentrations of the waste or base it on your own
15 analyses. Or you can use your own analyses to define
16 the appropriate concentrations for your system that you
17 think are acceptable. So you have an "or" approach
18 now. It's more flexibility. But there is potentially
19 a downside with the site specific waste acceptance
20 criteria. And that is you're basing it on analyses.
21 You have to be confident in that analyses. That
22 requires that 61.13 support area to be fairly robust
23 and you have to afford sufficient margin in what you
24 do because the world is complicated, things change,
25 information may change and if you haven't afforded

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 effective margin, then you could get yourself in a
2 difficult position when new information comes in and
3 maybe it's different than the information that you used
4 to develop your waste acceptance criteria.

5 So if you're relying on somebody else to
6 do your analysis and you're the person that receives
7 it and then makes a decision, these are things I would
8 be asking them, you know, how robust is this? What are
9 my sensitivities? What are the things that could
10 change that I need to be aware of and all that should
11 go into how you develop your site specific waste
12 acceptance criteria.

13 The guidance document, as I held up over
14 there, is a fairly decent-size document. I don't know
15 if it's changed since these slides were put together.
16 I know the ML number on the bottom here is wrong. Use
17 the one in Steve Dembek's presentation.

18 The guidance document, one of the things
19 you want to spend some time on before digging into the
20 weeds and potentially getting lost is Chapter 1 because
21 that will help you not get lost in the rest of the
22 document. It provides the overview and context for the
23 whole document, what are all its pieces and how do they
24 fit together?

25 We tried to provide a lot of examples,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tables, and figures so that it's not just all words that
2 you sit there and pull your hair out and say what are
3 these guys getting at?

4 It does have a chapter, Chapter 11, that
5 provides the use of other NRG guidance documents, so
6 this document is intended to in some cases supersede
7 information in older guidance documents, but then also
8 to supplement them. There's a lot of guidance out
9 there. We couldn't possibly revise all of that in one
10 document. It is a future activity that we'd
11 potentially consider, but it would be a large activity
12 similar to what the NRC did for those of you are familiar
13 with decommissioning to revise NUREG -- or to produce
14 NUREG 1757 which kind of became a big volume of a
15 stand-alone document for how to go about
16 decommissioning.

17 As it stands now, it's 434 pages, has 18
18 pages of references. It has a glossary and a variety
19 of appendices on things like hazard maps and features,
20 events, and processes which I'll talk about in a little
21 more detail.

22 So this is Figure 1-1 from that Chapter 1
23 of this document. And I think it's a pretty important
24 figure and helps you get an understanding of what's
25 going on. Basically, on the one side here it's the time

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 frames, the compliance period, the protective
2 assurance period, and the performance period. And
3 then coming down from the top are the three of the four
4 performance objectives. We don't have the protection
5 of the public during operations in there as it falls
6 prior to this diagram basically.

7 At the top is the assessment context and
8 scenario developments, so that's the whole features,
9 events, and processes analyses and now you come up with
10 the context. That feeds into the performance
11 objectives and how you evaluate those performance
12 objectives over all the time frames. And the
13 defense-in-depth arguments as the rule is written now
14 applies across all of these time frames and kind of
15 comes into the side. So you have these overlapping
16 features that kind of fit together and like a 3-D puzzle
17 let's say. And ultimately, you're trying to
18 demonstrate the subpart C performance objectives are
19 met down at the bottom. It might take a little bit --
20 I'll let that sink in when you go through the document.

21 So here's some example figures from the
22 guidance document that we have in the area of
23 performance assessment. And this is basically showing
24 you start with some information and data. You're going
25 to develop a conceptual model and then that feeds into

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 maybe abstractive models to estimate system
2 performance. And then even in the area of a particular
3 area or in the area of the abstracted hydrological model
4 you can go into more depth on the other side which is
5 you have a hydrologic conceptual model. You develop
6 that into some computation model which is based on
7 equations and data and so forth.

8 The performance assessment process starts
9 from the beginning here and goes to the end where you
10 produce a number and all of these things fit together.
11 Our guidance document is intended to cover all of these
12 components of say the analysis process or the
13 performance assessment.

14 We have included, and I don't intend for
15 you to read these, we have included the flow charts in
16 the document for those of you who like to step through
17 things. I want to know well, what do I do in Step A,
18 Step B, Step C. There's different types of people and
19 different types of brains, so we have information that
20 hopefully works with both types of people or different
21 types of people.

22 We have flow charts in there if you want
23 to step through the process and make sure you've done
24 all the steps. Of course, as I noted earlier, it is
25 a guidance document so you can propose other ways to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go about meeting the requirements. You don't have to
2 do exactly what the staff has in the guidance document.
3 But if you're going to deviate significantly, you
4 should probably make an argument for why you've
5 deviated and why it's okay. At least if we were
6 reviewing it, we would end up asking questions along
7 those lines. If an agreement state is reviewing it,
8 they could choose how they handle that sort of
9 information.

10 Site-stability. This is a diagram from
11 Chapter 5 of the guidance document. It has some
12 different components to it. The site characteristics,
13 of course, which are part of existing Part 61 and/or
14 proposed. We had to modify them in the proposed 61.50
15 based on the long time frames involved. So the existing
16 Part 61, 61.50, it has some exclusionary criteria that
17 you cannot have at your site in order to dispose of
18 low-level waste like water can't -- or waste can't be
19 disposed of in the water table. You can't be in a 100
20 year flood plain. There are some other things like
21 that. But when we went to then modify in the regulation
22 to especially go to the longer time frames, we started
23 discussing well how would somebody demonstrate they
24 aren't going to be in a 100 year flood plain for 10,000
25 years or potentially longer? That seems like an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 intractable problem to me. So we had to modify some
2 of that and be clear.

3 Some of the hydrologic aspects of the
4 system which were the reasons for many of the initial
5 failures of older low-level waste facilities prior to
6 Part 61, those are exclusionary for the 500 year time
7 frame, so if you're in a 100 year flood plain today or
8 expected to be in the next 500 years, that's not a good
9 site. You should probably choose a different site.

10 But when you move out in time, then we wrote
11 these -- rewrote the 61.50 to allow you to make kind
12 of performance-based arguments as to why the criteria
13 or characteristics are acceptable or unacceptable for
14 your particular site. So you'll see that. Look at
15 61.50 and how we rewrote that and how we packaged it.

16 Ultimately, 61.50 though meshes with the
17 performance objective 61.44, the stability performance
18 objective. And this is important. I think maybe if
19 there's one area that popped out to me and deserves some
20 attention, initially we didn't think deserves some
21 attention, it was in the stability. There was a lot
22 of discussion about -- or a lot of debate about the
23 long-term stability. And NRC, when they developed the
24 regulations, the idea was you're disposing of mainly
25 short-lived waste, but you're going to ensure it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stable while that waste is there. It wasn't that well,
2 we're going to dispose of any waste and you only have
3 to ensure it's stable while that waste is there.
4 There's a difference between those two things. And so
5 conceptually, we had to reflect that or we did reflect
6 that in the new package is that the stability is an
7 important part of the evaluation.

8 Okay, so this protective insurance
9 example. It's Figure 6-1 in the guidance. This is an
10 area which we're sure we'll get your comments on and
11 we definitely want your comments on. The Commission
12 directed us to provide this tier, the protective
13 assurance period. And based on the language, the way
14 we did that is it's a minimization process or an
15 optimization process. So you don't have a strict dose
16 limit for this tier, but you're trying to minimize your
17 impact. So it's similar to ALARA, but for reasons we
18 couldn't just use the ALARA language that's in the
19 existing Part 61.

20 But what we did is develop kind of these
21 different levels of impacts that you may generate and
22 depending what level you're in that defines kind of how
23 much resources would be practical for you to try to
24 apply to reduce those impacts. And we avoided the
25 issue of the time-based discounting which seems like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 a real red herring and nobody is ever going to agree
2 and there isn't an appropriate answer to that I don't
3 think, based on what we know today. But what we did
4 do was is we did a risk-based discounting or I would
5 call it the inverse of risk-based discounting. So if
6 your risk is low, then you're done. So if you're in
7 Level 0, you don't have to do anything more to show that
8 you've met the performance or the protective assurance
9 period performance objective.

10 As you move up the scale and your
11 protective doses are larger, then in a nonlinear
12 fashion you need to show that you spent appropriate
13 resources to try to mitigate those impacts, including
14 a challenging point up in Level 3 up here, is what if
15 you're above the 500 millirem, then what do you do?

16 What we have now in our guidance document
17 is you may want to consider if you're an agreement state
18 regulator, is this the right site for that waste or is
19 there another site that could take that waste and do
20 it with much lower impacts. That seems something
21 reasonable that we, NRC, from like a national
22 perspective would want to do. You don't have to force
23 it into a particular site if you have a better site that
24 can take it. So that's part of this process in the
25 protective assurance analyses. I'm sure we'll get a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot of comments. It's kind of a new idea. It's not
2 in Part 61 at all, aside from maybe the analogy in the
3 ALARA process.

4 And in the performance period, we have
5 examples like this table here which I also don't expect
6 for you to read, but basically, the performance period
7 is based on the analysis when you have sufficient
8 quantities of long-lived waste. So long-lived waste
9 is based on the Class A values on a facility-average
10 basis. So you take your whole volume or mass of your
11 facility and average all your activity over it and see
12 if you're above or below Class A. If you're above Class
13 A, then you need to consider these values, not on a
14 package basis, on a facility basis. There's a
15 significant difference between those two things. So
16 that will allow you to dispose of a fair amount of
17 long-lived waste in concentrated amounts or dilute
18 long-lived waste in a large volume amount. It's only
19 when you have concentrated long-lived waste in a large
20 amount that it's going to kick you in to need to do this
21 analyses which is similar to the protective assurance
22 period. It's kind of a just show me what the impacts
23 are. Tell me why you've minimized them or reduced them
24 as much as you can. I think that's all I need to say
25 on that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay, in the appendices to the guidance
2 document, we have a variety of hazard maps and those
3 are to be used in the features, events, and process
4 area. This is an example of areas of potential
5 flooding. We have a GIS person, Allen Gross, who is
6 very skilled in this area and he developed these maps
7 for us that we thought would be helpful in developing
8 the scope of the analysis and in looking at the 61.50
9 site characteristics.

10 There are caveats with this though as you
11 probably can recognize. There's issues of resolution
12 and how interpreting this image and applying it a
13 particular site. It is just made to be a tool to
14 enhance that process of trying to evaluate what's
15 important -- what would I expect would be important for
16 a site at any location in the U.S. here for a variety
17 of the processes. So it has flooding. It has volcanic
18 activity and has seismic. It has all of the different
19 characteristics that you might feel would potentially
20 impact a facility some time in the future. So that's
21 an example of a hopefully useful tool that we put in
22 there to help people to do this futures, events, and
23 processes evaluation.

24 That's all I had. As Stephen indicated,
25 you're free to contact us if you have questions in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process of developing your questions. We do have --
2 we do record any email exchanges we have with you, our
3 phone conversations, and they become part of the
4 record, so keep that in mind. We don't take anything
5 off the record. No off the record comments in the
6 rulemaking process.

7 Do you want to do questions now, Chip, or
8 take a break and then do it after.

9 MR. CAMERON: I'm asking Larry. We're a
10 little bit ahead of schedule, but we were going to take
11 a break in ten minutes from now and I'm not sure that
12 it makes sense to jump into this. Why don't we take
13 a 15-minute break now and then we'll come back and go
14 for questions. How about 10 minutes to 10 we'll start
15 off. Thank you.

16 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
17 went off the record at 9:35 a.m. and resumed at 9:55
18 a.m.)

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, if we can get
20 everybody into their seats, we'll go to commentary.

21 I think Dave did an amazing job of
22 distilling the proposed rule and the Reg. Guide for you.
23 And you can tell from the slides that it's just a simple
24 and straightforward proposed rule. A lot of people I
25 saw making the sign of the cross out there during your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 presentation, but we are going to start out in the room
2 with comments or questions for Dave.

3 We'll go to people on the phone. And after
4 everybody gets a shot at commenting, then we'll see if
5 there's a chance to have a dialogue on some of the major
6 issues. Who would like to start out for us on the
7 proposed rule. And again, these won't be considered
8 on the record comments, even though Peggy is taking a
9 transcript.

10 Just please introduce yourself to us.

11 MR. KALINOWSKI: Tom Kalinowski with D.W.
12 James Consulting.

13 David, I really appreciated your
14 presentation. I liked the direction that you're going
15 with the performance assessments. One of the
16 questions I have and maybe this is going to be addressed
17 in the guidance documents, but as we move into some of
18 the more less prescriptive categories or limits that
19 come out of a performance assessment like this, is there
20 going to be guidance in the NUREG that kind of discusses
21 to the agreement states regulators how to apply them
22 so that they're not just looking for a number like the
23 500 years you mentioned at the end of the assessment
24 and maybe they want to consider looking at a different
25 site. But that easily becomes a hard limit where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 somebody makes that decision. But I don't think that's
2 necessarily your intention. So is that going to be
3 addressed in the NUREG?

4 MR. ESH: Yes. In the -- you're right.
5 Most of that information I would say is in the guidance
6 or we attempted to put it in the guidance. We tried
7 to put in a fair amount of examples on areas where we
8 thought people might have a particular question or want
9 to analyze a particular site or condition. So we made
10 a hypothetical example and said this site has this
11 characteristic. This is a decision they're trying to
12 make. This is some of the information associated with
13 it. And then here's the decision that you would make
14 based on that information. So it kind of steps through
15 in some examples.

16 But in terms of some of the -- I'd say
17 aspects of the rule that don't have say a number
18 assigned to them and are more subjective or
19 interpretive part, there's a lot of information in the
20 guidance document that should allow somebody to go
21 through and evaluate one of those, but we didn't put
22 numbers in the guidance document that aren't in the
23 regulation per se. It's not completely true. You'll
24 see there are some areas where we put in some examples
25 of maybe thresholds or numbers of how to consider

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things, and one I'll give you is in the area of
2 disruptive events and when you need to include
3 disruptive events in your assessment or not.

4 What's been done in some other areas like
5 say in Part 63 is to have a frequency cutoff of if there
6 are less than 1 in 10,000 likelihood in 10,000 years,
7 then they don't need to be included as part of the scope
8 of the performance assessment. If they are a larger
9 frequency than that, they do.

10 We have a number in the guidance document.
11 It's not that number. It's a bigger number as to if
12 you're below that frequency, then it doesn't need to
13 be in the guidance document. If you're above that
14 frequency, it does. And there is some explanation for
15 why we think that number is a reasonable one to use.
16 So that's an example of where we provided a number in
17 the guidance document that isn't in the regulation, but
18 that was because there are some areas where we felt it
19 was going to be kind of difficult to just come up with
20 a subjective answer to that problem for the different
21 agreement state regulator without having something to
22 look at or consider. Certainly, they can then come up
23 with something different if they don't agree with that
24 or they have a reason to do something different. But
25 at least we wanted to give a starting point.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I may have given you a wishy-washy
2 answer in a couple of different directions, but look
3 at the guidance document and you'll see we have examples
4 in there. We did provide a few numbers as kind of
5 guideposts, but we don't -- you can't put requirements
6 in the guidance document that aren't in the regulation
7 to be concise.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. We're
9 going to go to Lisa and please introduce yourself.

10 MS. EDWARDS: Morning, Dave. Thanks for
11 the presentation. This is Lisa Edwards. So I haven't
12 read the draft Part 61 yet. I know. But so it's
13 difficult for me to come up with any coherent questions
14 related to the specific guidance. But I am interested
15 in your perspective of how a site-specific WAC, if it
16 coexisted with the classification tables as is or
17 future updated classification tables, how the two would
18 relate or not relate or supersede each other.

19 MR. ESH: Right. So in 61.58, waste
20 acceptance criteria approach as I indicated earlier,
21 that's basically an "or" approach now so you can use
22 the waste classification tables or you can come up with
23 site-specific tables basically. That's essentially
24 what you're talking about whether you're going to use
25 the generic ones NRC developed or whether you're going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to come up with your own.

2 Those two things will coexist, but the way
3 the regulation is written at a particular site for the
4 disposal part of the problem, if you come up with site
5 specific waste acceptance criteria and those are what
6 you want to use to base your disposal decisions on, you
7 can use those irrespective of the fact that you have
8 these other waste classification tables. So you may
9 have disposal concentrations that are above or below
10 those other -- the table values that would define what
11 you can take at your site.

12 MR. CAMERON: Do you want to follow up on
13 that?

14 MS. EDWARDS: Yes.

15 MR. CAMERON: All right.

16 MS. EDWARDS: This is Lisa Edwards again.
17 So could you envision a scenario where some portion of
18 the waste that is accepted at the site is governed under
19 the waste classification tables and a different set of
20 material or waste is governed under a site-specific
21 waste acceptance criteria?

22 MR. ESH: Well, conceivably, yes, because
23 there are some isotopes that aren't in the waste
24 classification tables, so I could envision a situation
25 where -- and this is just me thinking out loud here,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but you could develop a site-specific WAC for those
2 isotopes that aren't in the tables and use the table
3 values for the other isotopes. That would be I think
4 a reasonable approach. We generally -- in all things
5 regulatory though we never like cherry picking, and we
6 never like cherry picking in the non-conservative
7 direction as regulators. That's the way we're wired.
8 So if it was a situation where you're going to take the
9 maximum of either, you'd have to have a good argument
10 for why that's an appropriate approach. But if it as
11 a more practical reason like the example I gave, yes,
12 I think that would be fair game.

13 MR. CAMERON: This is Larry Camper.

14 MR. CAMPER: I wanted to add to that, Lisa.
15 Thank you. That's a very astute question. And I
16 wanted to add to it specifically because your question
17 reminds me of a conversation that I had with
18 Commissioner Magwood in particular, and other
19 commissioners as well, but Commissioner Magwood was the
20 Commission champion, if you will, behind the role of
21 the WAC.

22 Now, in the conversation that I had with
23 the commissioner and other commissioners I pointed out
24 that the use of a waste acceptance criteria is currently
25 a reality. All of these sites have a waste acceptance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 criteria. What the Commission did in this rulemaking
2 is to elevate the role of the waste acceptance criteria,
3 which has heretofore been an operational parameter, as
4 you all know. But in doing this it elevated it with
5 an "or" pathway.

6 Now, Dave answered your question, and he
7 gave you an absolutely accurate scientific operational
8 answer. The problem is; and this is what I shared with
9 the commissioners, I see a political implication. As
10 you all know, the waste classification system that
11 we've been using for the last 30 years is certainly well
12 embodied in our process. If you go look at the various
13 licenses that are in existence today, you'll see that
14 these sites are authorized for the disposal of class
15 A, class B, class C waste, except in the case of Utah
16 of course, Rusty, where it's class A.

17 And so the challenge is going to be when
18 the industry for particularly well-performing sites
19 wants to rely upon disposal at those sites based upon
20 the characteristics of that site, it's going to involve
21 conversations with the regulators and perhaps with the
22 state legislatures. Because envision if you will a
23 situation where you're able to dispose of waste at a
24 particular site because of its performance that is well
25 in excess of the existing concentration limits in some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part of the table.

2 So the Commission was well aware of that.
3 And I told them that that issue would come up. And I
4 think that comments about that along the way would be
5 helpful as the Commission visits the final rule. That
6 all make sense?

7 MS. EDWARDS: Yes. Thank you.

8 MR. ESH: And I would add to that that I
9 think there is maybe a false sense of security
10 associated with using the waste classification tables,
11 so if people haven't gone through and see what was done
12 to develop those tables, they make think like, okay,
13 this is absolutely protective under all conditions no
14 matter what, but the reality is, as I stated earlier,
15 those tables were developed with a certain set of
16 assumptions and the assumption is that another location
17 may or may not align with those assumptions.

18 And the example I'll give is with respect
19 to say -- I think it was plutonium. Plutonium at a
20 humid site, the doses are lower because you get less
21 re-suspension in the air. Plutonium at an arid site,
22 the doses are higher for a given concentration of
23 plutonium. So the fact that the humid site conditions
24 were used to develop the waste classification tables
25 because they were more conservative for certain

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 isotopes and certain pathways doesn't necessarily
2 translate into that that's conservative for all
3 isotopes and all pathways.

4 So if you had a particular waste stream
5 that had a lot of plutonium and you were putting it in
6 an arid site and you used the waste classification
7 tables, the future potential impact if the intrusion
8 occurred and all the things aligned might be different
9 than what you would think would be the result. So you
10 would just need to understand that. And the
11 site-specific analysis approach is definitely a better
12 way to do it because you can reflect the actual
13 conditions and hopefully you're more risk-aligned.

14 The challenge is mainly in the area of the
15 scenarios. What is appropriate scenarios to use?
16 This gets into speculating about future human behavior.
17 If you open that up, you have stakeholders that will
18 have very creative scenarios that they want you to
19 evaluate, and the likelihood of those may or may not
20 be reasonable, but it can be a very time-consuming and
21 difficult process. That's why in our guidance we have
22 a lot of information on scenarios and what scenarios
23 you can use and how you develop them. The smart
24 approach many times is to just be conservative and use
25 kind of the traditional scenarios and see where you are.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And then if you aren't in a good place, well then, see,
2 you can sharpen pencil and make a good argument for some
3 alternative scenarios. MR. CAMERON: Thank
4 you. Thank you, Dave. Thank you, Larry. This is
5 John Greeves.

6 MR. GREEVES: Yes, Dave and Larry, I'm
7 glad Lisa and others have asked this question because
8 it was on my list, too. I'm going to strip the politics
9 out of it and I'm going to posit a question, and the
10 question is if an applicant comes forward with a greater
11 than class C disposal request to site, etcetera, that
12 comes to you. Does the either/or mean they get to pick?
13 And I see no reason that applicant wouldn't come forward
14 with we're going to pick the -- we're going to do all
15 that work for site-specific analysis and we're going
16 to pick the -- do basically a waste acceptance criteria
17 either now or later. Can you answer the question?
18 What would the NRC do with an applicant -- and the
19 question, who chooses? And I think the applicants are
20 going to say they want to choose because they're
21 spending a lot of money on these site-specific analyses
22 and work and site selection, etcetera, and they
23 don't -- if it's either/or, I think they're going to
24 pick waste acceptance criteria. So in that case you
25 would get the question, either now or later. I mean,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this is early days, so I don't think we need to force
2 an answer, but that's an obvious question. So did I
3 frame it correctly?

4 MR. ESH: Right. Yes, and I understand
5 your question. I don't think I have an answer. As
6 Larry indicated, I think there will be a political
7 component to that sort of question. There will be a
8 substantial legal component to that sort of question,
9 neither of which I'm qualified to answer.

10 In the technical area I even would have
11 some reservations because we have the waste
12 classification system in low-level waste, and then we
13 have high-level waste that's defined not I'd say in a
14 technical way, but in a verbiage or language way. And
15 to what extent can you rely on site-specific analysis
16 to solve your problems? Because basically when Part
17 61 initially was developed it was focused on large
18 amounts of short-lived waste, a little bit of
19 long-lived waste. Now in this rulemaking we tried to
20 make it accommodate something that may contain more
21 long-lived waste.

22 When you move to then GTCC, GTCC in many
23 cases -- some of it may be similar to low-level waste
24 radiologically. Some of it may be similar to
25 high-level waste. So at what point do you draw that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 line of -- from a national perspective or U.S.
2 Government perspective? Up to this point the
3 objective for high-level waste in the U.S. and most
4 countries is some sort of deep disposal. The disposal
5 depth is a key thing that you can use to mitigate risk,
6 especially for material that might have a lot of
7 activity, high-specific activity or long-lived
8 activity.

9 So you have to kind of step back and say
10 when is the GTCC or what material is pushing the limits
11 to what I should be doing and trying to rely on with
12 analysis? That's the best answer I can give you at this
13 point in time. I can tell you that we have a SECY paper
14 on GTCC and that issue is being worked right now in
15 parallel with this rulemaking. I can't answer how
16 that's going to turn out.

17 MR. CAMERON: And I think John might have
18 a follow-up, but let me get Larry Camper and Chris
19 McKenney on before we go back to him. Larry?

20 MR. CAMPER: Yes, thank you, Chip. Thank
21 you, Dave. Once again Dave I think gave an excellent
22 technical answer to John's great question. And as you
23 know, we would not say today or preordain how that might
24 be handled, obviously. You'd have to look at it on a
25 case-by-case basis, review the licensing application,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and so forth. So we can't answer that question
2 specifically. But I can raise a couple of things. And
3 I don't want to spend too much time talking about GTCC,
4 but we're here and it's a good opportunity to share
5 information.

6 As you all know -- in listening to John's
7 question, as you know you won't find any technical
8 criteria in Part 61 around GTCC. You won't see any
9 concentration values addressed in a table, for example.
10 And there's different kinds of GTCC, as you all know.
11 Some of it's pretty radiologically strong and some of
12 it's not as strong. But it's all GTCC waste. So
13 there's no technical criteria. So we would have to
14 address that issue. And then we'd have to address the
15 application itself.

16 John pointed out that the GTCC application
17 would come to us, and the reason that he does that is
18 because the Low-Level Waste Policy Act states the fact
19 that if the material GTCC was licensed by the Nuclear
20 Regulatory Commission; we refer to that as commercial,
21 then it shall be disposed of in a facility licensed by
22 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

23 And in an effort to have truth in lending,
24 it is important to point out that WCC -- or WCS has
25 petitioned the State of Texas about wanting to dispose

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of GTCC at that WCS site. And we have been having
2 extensive discussions with the State of Texas about
3 this, this jurisdictional issue that John points out
4 in his question, and we have gotten a letter from the
5 State of Texas. It's in ADAMS. And Texas has asked
6 us some very pointed jurisdictional questions. And we
7 asked them to do that in our discussions.

8 So we are as a staff currently looking at
9 that issue. It was raised by the petition from WCS to
10 the State of Texas, that in turn from Texas to us. And
11 as Dave pointed out, we do plan to communicate with our
12 Commission in May around GTCC waste. That
13 communication will include for the current Commission
14 a historical overview of what the Commission has done
15 about GTCC in the past, positions that have been taken.
16 It will include information that clearly describes just
17 what GTCC waste is, how much of it there is and so forth.
18 And Terrence Brimfield gave a talk during the symposia
19 that just concluded about that. And there will also
20 be some legal context added for Commission awareness.

21 So do continue to pay attention to that
22 communication to the staff. We'll provide it to the
23 Commission. Currently scheduled for May. It could
24 slip a little bit, but it's in the May-June time frame.
25 But, John, great question.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Chris? And please
2 introduce yourself.

3 MR. MCKENNEY: Thank you. Chris
4 McKenney, branch chief for the Performance Assessment
5 Branch. The one predicator for John's comment was
6 about either/or and who chooses. There are several
7 places in the regulations where we have "or"
8 situations; in Part 20 and such like that, that the
9 licensee is the one who gets to choose which method they
10 are proposing to use. And I don't see any reason why
11 this would not be in normal practice, barring of course
12 other larger laws that might predicate something that
13 that would not be the practice in this. So it would
14 be default to the licensee being able to choose.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Chris.
16 John, do you have anything that you want to add at this
17 point? And then we'll go on.

18 MR. GREEVES: I don't want to belabor the
19 point because we're going to go over this again in
20 future meetings, but the regulatory process -- I
21 subscribe to clear, safe and implementable. And this
22 question that Lisa and others raised is going to be an
23 implementation question. So I'd urge you to consider
24 this in future meetings and find a way that an applicant
25 and the NRC can implement this that's straightforward.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to Tom
3 Magette.

4 MR. MAGETTE: Thanks, Chip. My name is
5 Tom Magette. I'm with Price Waterhouse Coopers. I
6 have a question for you, David. First of all, thank
7 you for your presentation. Look forward to reading the
8 details of the rule. I haven't read them all either.
9 But as Larry went through the history this morning, I
10 think it's safe to say we started in a place where we
11 had more of a waste stream-focused concern and we were
12 looking at a way to change the regulations potentially
13 around how to ensure that certain waste streams got
14 disposed of safely that were not specifically
15 articulated in the waste classification tables.

16 In my view it seems that we have evolved.
17 And we've seen this. We all have been involved and we
18 see this coming. But we've now evolved to a place where
19 it's more about everything at every site and that we
20 are, or you are about to create essentially a brand new
21 regulatory regime for the disposal of all low-level
22 waste anywhere, which means that every site, whether
23 they were initially involved in looking at taking a new
24 and different waste stream or doing something that
25 could have been viewed as falling outside the existing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulatory regime is now going to have to go look at
2 defense-in-depth in a new way. They're going to have
3 to look at this protective assurance period. They're
4 going to have to do a PA. We're going to have to start
5 over at every site. Is that your view? Is that what
6 the Commission intends?

7 MR. ESH: Right. I don't think that's
8 what the Commission intends, nor do I think that's what
9 we did. So in the proposed materials it has new
10 elements to it, but the meat of it is still the same.
11 And you're right though, in this process everybody
12 wanted to put their stamp on it. So it's become kind
13 of a well-traveled passport.

14 But the reality is, like I indicated in one
15 of my slides, there was one area that needed to be
16 changed. The rest of it kind of grew off of that. And
17 some of it I think is very logical and straightforward.
18 Like for instance when we talked about the depleted
19 uranium issue and we said, well, the waste
20 classification tables have this issue because they
21 don't include the uranium isotopes because a waste
22 stream of large amounts of depleted uranium was not
23 included in the final tables when they were developed.
24 So if we have this generic issue with this part of the
25 regulation, then why do we not think we could

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 potentially have it again in the future with some new
2 waste stream?

3 So that led to making it more generic and
4 just saying here's a depleted uranium-centric criteria
5 in a certain part of the rule. If you want to dispose
6 of depleted uranium, you meet this. Everybody else
7 just keep it the way it is. So we added the ability
8 to include other waste streams. And then all the other
9 things kind of just propagated off of that, I would say.

10 But if you feel there are things that are
11 added that -- that's a good comment to make. Do you
12 really need this? Based on the problem you were trying
13 to solve and what you're trying to accomplish do you
14 really need to have these changes in this particular
15 area? That's something we would want to hear, because
16 we don't want -- even though it may be and it may seem
17 fairly complicated now, we -- I think it was something
18 maybe John Greeves said, we want plain and simple,
19 implementable, easy to understand. That's what we
20 want. So if there are ways that we can do that and
21 change what we've proposed, we would want to hear that.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Tom. This
23 is Rusty Lundberg.

24 MR. LUNDBERG: Thank you, Chip. Rusty
25 Lundberg with Utah DEQ. Dave, also to echo what others

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have said, appreciate not only your presentation, but
2 all of the effort that went into developing a lot of
3 this. Lot of comments that you had to consider, a lot
4 of complexities, and I think that this final
5 culmination I think at least marks a good milestone for
6 all of us to work from.

7 I wanted to go to your defense-in-depth
8 aspect. You mentioned that this is a little bit newer
9 view for us as we look at performance assessments. One
10 of the aspects of that was to be looking at
11 concentration limits potentially. What I was
12 wondering is as you look at some of the long-lived
13 isotopes can you provide just a little bit of a glimpse
14 as to what you see, how that may integrate with
15 long-lived isotopes in terms of -- in other words are
16 you looking at limits at time of disposal or do you count
17 for in growth of the progeny in some of this as you look
18 at how do you ensure that you're meeting a
19 defense-in-depth-kind of view with concentration
20 limits?

21 MR. ESH: Right, in the analysis we
22 envision that people would include parents and progeny.
23 That's reflected in our proposed definition for what
24 is long-lived and also in the analysis, or in the
25 guidance document. The imposed and concentration

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 limits is one of the main ways that people can attempt
2 to provide a limit or restriction in the system to
3 prevent dose or risk. And that is based on analyses,
4 but we feel it combines with say -- you're going to put
5 engineer barriers into the system and your analysis is
6 going to try to assess how those barriers are going to
7 perform. Hopefully those barriers in some cases will
8 perform better than you anticipate. Engineers are
9 good at analyzing what they've seen and maybe not so
10 good at analyzing what they haven't seen, is my kind
11 of way I understand things.

12 So but the concentration limits themselves
13 is one of those key mechanisms you can use to mitigate
14 or manage uncertainties. And so, I can envision a
15 scenario where that's definitely part of the
16 defense-in-depth argument. You say, look, I'm putting
17 all these barriers in place, I'm going to have long-term
18 controls, I've analyzed my site characteristics and my
19 site doesn't have all these things that I expect is
20 going to disrupt it in the future. But then in addition
21 to that I'm going to develop these waste concentrations
22 that in the event of I'm not right about all these other
23 layers of things that I've put in the system, that
24 provides a check or a balance to mitigate what could
25 happen in the future. That's the smart way to do it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 One of the issues with that, as I mentioned
2 earlier, is the receptor scenario. So if you're not
3 very conservative with how you define your receptors,
4 that can get you into trouble in a hurry because there
5 can be many, many order of magnitude difference between
6 certain receptors and scenarios in certain other ones.

7 But, yes, that's kind of how I see the
8 concentration limits would be part of the argument. It
9 is one of the key checks and balances, not just for
10 61.42, but can also be used or should be used for 61.41.
11 And the existing regulation indicates that, especially
12 for long-lived mobile isotopes that you should be
13 developing inventory limits. It's the same sort of
14 thing. Inventory limits is the product of
15 concentration in the volume or mass.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good. Larry, do you
17 want to add something? Larry Camper.

18 MR. CAMPER: Thank you. That's a great
19 question, Rusty. Thank you. I would take this
20 opportunity to point out that the Commission in the SRM
21 specifically directed the staff to address the issue
22 of defense-in-depth, DID. Now, we all know that
23 defense-in-depth has been an operational reality for
24 all sites for all these years. But again, the
25 Commission put emphasis upon defense-in-depth. And at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the same time the Commission put emphasis upon the term
2 "safety case."

3 Now, most of you know that the term "safety
4 case" is a well-established term and concept in the
5 International Atomic Energy Agency vernacular.
6 However, the Commission specifically said that
7 defense-in-depth plus performance assessment equals
8 safety case. And so the staff as part of this
9 rulemaking process did go about defining "safety case,"
10 and we did specifically bring to bear certain
11 information around DID as specifically directed.

12 I will tell you that there is certainly a
13 lot of interest in one of the Commission offices in
14 particular about this concept of defense-in-depth.
15 And so, as you read the rule and you look at what we
16 have done as a staff to address the Commission direction
17 around defense-in-depth plus PA equals safety case, any
18 comments would be welcomed by the staff, specifically
19 around that particular subject matter.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to the
21 phones and then we'll see if there's anybody who has
22 a comment on the Webinar, although I'm not sure where
23 those Webinar comments are going to come in. Okay?

24 So there's no on there?

25 OPERATOR: We have one question in queue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

2 OPERATOR: Our first question comes from
3 Roger Seitz. You may begin.

4 MR. SEITZ: Hello, this is Roger Seitz
5 from Savannah River National Laboratory. Hello, Dave.

6 MR. ESH: Hi, Roger.

7 MR. SEITZ: I'd like to echo some of the
8 previous statements. I'd like to commend the NRC staff
9 on the efforts to address input that's been received
10 today. And there's a lot of information to digest and
11 I look forward to the opportunity to review it.

12 I do have one question based on your
13 initial presentation. You used the terms minimize and
14 optimize in the context of impact during the
15 performance assurance period. And I would suggest
16 focusing more on the idea of optimization rather than
17 minimization, because minimize can be a difficult
18 standard to modify and it's difficult to know when it
19 is met in a regulatory context.

20 MR. CAMERON: David, comment?

21 MR. ESH: Right. Thank you, Roger. Yes,
22 I understand your comment. And that process for the
23 protective assurance period, I would call it an
24 optimization process with the target being a minimum.
25 So you're trying to get things as low as achievable

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 given technical and economic considerations.

2 So, and look at Chapter 6 there and tell
3 us what you think -- and a guidance document. It was
4 a challenging area to write and develop. So it is an
5 area that we definitely want a lot of feedback on and
6 see whether we've hit the target or not, or if other
7 people have some suggestions about how it could be done
8 differently.

9 MR. CAMERON: And we have something from
10 Chris McKenney on this same subject.

11 MR. MCKENNEY: Somebody asked we didn't us
12 ALARA since ALARA is a standardized optimization
13 phrased used in the NRC for this one. And that is
14 because the actual definition of ALARA is optimization
15 under a dose limit. So to have ALARA in place, we would
16 have to have a dose limit in place. And the second tier
17 does not technically have a dose -- it does not have
18 a dose limit. It is a point around which you are trying
19 to optimize in the decision space. It is not a dose
20 limit within the regulation space. So that is why we
21 had to come up with a little bit more creative language
22 around explaining it. It's similar to ALARA, but it
23 can't be exactly as ALARA because ALARA as defined in
24 Part 20 is based on reduction below the actual dose
25 limit.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Chris. Thanks,
2 Roger. Yomi, is there anybody else on the line?

3 OPERATOR: I'm showing no other questions
4 in queue. As a reminder, participants, please press
5 star one and record your name if you'd like to ask a
6 question.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We'll go back here in
8 the room. And we'll be back to Yomi to check.

9 MR. ROBERTSON: Hello. My name is Gary
10 Robertson and I'm representing myself today. And
11 Gregory, I want to give you two thumbs up. You guys
12 have done a great job. I've got one question related
13 to defense-in-depth and the use of engineered barrier
14 terminology.

15 I'm wondering if your primary example of
16 engineered barriers and defense-in-depth would be
17 something like a Hanford barrier, which has multi
18 layers, but if you do have problems, then you have major
19 in repairing it. And I'm wondering if somebody chose
20 a thick homogenous cover with probably all the elements
21 of the Hanford barrier blended in it would you give
22 credit -- for example, the gravel, the sand, the
23 vegetative portion. How would it play out with
24 defense-in-depth being a homogenous thick layer?

25 MR. ESH: Right. So the use of -- I should

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 say maybe if you look at the slide where it says "Use
2 of Barriers" -- "barrier" would probably be a better
3 term, more general, because you want to analyze all the
4 components of the system that are helping you mitigate
5 the impacts. And that could be engineered barriers,
6 say a concrete structure, a vault, an engineered waste
7 form, whether it's concrete, glass, anything else that
8 you might come up with, as well as the surface covers
9 or surface caps that may have two functions, or at least
10 two functions, maybe three or four. But they're going
11 to try to minimize water contact with the waste and
12 they're going to try to minimize erosion so you don't
13 result in future release.

14 And whether it's a Hanford-type barrier or
15 maybe a different type of design, some sort of
16 evapotranspiration type cover or the kind of common
17 resistive-type covers you might find in a RCRA facility
18 or something else. Any of those can be a barrier that's
19 used in low-level waste. And we don't prescribe
20 certain types of barriers or even different
21 combinations of barriers. A licensee is free to use
22 whatever barriers they think can achieve their
23 objectives and then provide -- basically this is
24 looking for analysis of how those barriers function in
25 the system and how they're helping you achieve your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 objectives.

2 And for a low-risk site, as with anything
3 in Part 61, because it's supposed to be implemented in
4 a risk-informed performance-based way, you would
5 generally be able to provide less information and maybe
6 even in some cases a qualitative description of say your
7 barriers and how they're mitigating your impact,
8 especially when your risks are projected to be very low.
9 If your risks are projected to be higher, and especially
10 if they're near any sort of regulatory limits when they
11 apply, well, then you probably want to provide more
12 detail and maybe technical analysis of how the
13 different components work. And we had that in the
14 original guidance document. We still have it in the
15 current one, some examples of barrier analysis. And
16 there's different ways that people go about that.

17 But your question about whether you could use the
18 Hanford barrier or some other type of barrier, you could
19 use either. You would definitely want to address the
20 resiliency of that barrier and also then the redundancy
21 of the barriers in the system, because the problem with
22 the defense-in-depth area applied to waste disposal is
23 normally defense-in-depth is applied to active
24 systems. So you have a reactor system and you have a
25 pump and then you have a backup pump And then you maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 have monitoring of a control system by operators of
2 those two pumps. So you have multiple layers and
3 redundancy and resiliency in your system.

4 A passive waste disposal system, it's a
5 different kind of beast that you're talking about
6 evaluating. And the Commission gave us that direction
7 to apply the defense-in-depth to the system, which we
8 did, but we also recognized that it may need to be
9 applied a little differently in some cases than what
10 you would to a traditional engineering system.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to go to
12 Linda. And if you could just --

13 MS. LINDA SUTORA: Linda Sutora at the
14 Department of Energy. So just for maybe another view,
15 we actually would view all of that whole thing as a
16 defense-in-depth. And when we do the use of the
17 barriers analysis, we actually do the natural barriers
18 and the manmade barriers as kind of like one view as
19 the system. So it's just different views of the same
20 thing, but I mean this captures everything that we
21 would --

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Linda.

23 Yomi, is there anybody on the line who
24 wants to talk to us?

25 OPERATOR: I'm showing no other questions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in queue.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody else in the
3 room who wants to comment? Okay. Let's go to Dan and
4 then we'll go to the gentleman in the back. And if you
5 could just --

6 MR. SCHRUM: Dan Schrum with Energy
7 Solutions again. Again, thanks to the team for pulling
8 this together. It's going to be a fun few months as
9 we get to go through this with you. So the questions
10 I'm going to ask, I apologize, I haven't gone through
11 it. Had other things on my mind, I guess. But just
12 generally speaking, we had a little discussion after
13 you introduced this concept in 61.28, the updated PA
14 at closure. Could you elaborate on that a little bit?
15 I'm envisioning it's closed. You update the PA. Oh,
16 we've got a problem. Because that's real life. And
17 engineers don't typically do that at the end of a design
18 or the end of a build. We do as-builts. I can see
19 that. But what are you envisioning on that? Then I've
20 actually got two more questions.

21 MR. ESH: Right. So, in that case it's
22 basically you have this period of time where after
23 you've done your initial assessment and started
24 operating and disposed of waste and then eventually you
25 get to closure. You get information along the way of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how things may be working. Or say for instance you put
2 your final closure cover in and maybe you're worried
3 about radon and you get some measurements of what your
4 radon fluxes are or your moisture contents of your cover
5 system may be. That sort of information then gets
6 reflected in your final assessment at the end.
7 Basically it's a verification step. Because when you
8 initially do your licensing, you're doing a forecast
9 or projection the best you can based on the information
10 you have. There's no reason not to update that when
11 you get to the closure step and verify that at least
12 at that point in time that additional information that
13 may have supports your case as you initially made it.

14 MR. HUNTER: From your two approaches that
15 you -- this is Zach Hunter. For the two approaches that
16 you suggested it's more of an as-built. By the time
17 of closure you'll have your final inventory, you'll
18 have your actual finals on your cover, you'll be able
19 to incorporate any other information, as Dave says,
20 that has been gathered over time of science,
21 monitoring, if you had any updates on how the
22 groundwater flow works in the system, the climate
23 works, other things like that. And you would have
24 basically more of a final PA that would be able to go
25 into long-term understanding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: And a follow-up, Dan?

2 MR. SCHRUM: Okay. I'll accept that for
3 now. I'm more envisioning an ongoing process as
4 opposed to the thing at the end, because it's hard to
5 put a radon barrier in after it's done. So anyway,
6 that's where my mind went.

7 On the same slide actually the 61.58 WAC
8 "or" approach; again, I haven't read it, are these all
9 going to be category -- I think it's category B? So
10 a WAC is a B also?

11 MR. ESH: Right.

12 MR. SCHRUM: So that's all B?

13 MR. ESH: Right.

14 MR. SCHRUM: Everything that --

15 MR. ESH: Isn't it?

16 PARTICIPANT: We got to get you on --

17 PARTICIPANT: All the essential
18 components are supposed to be B, so --

19 McKENNEY: Dave is correct. This is
20 Chris McKenney. That's more correct. All the
21 essential components, there are a number of Bs in the
22 thing, but I don't believe that every sub-component of
23 61.58 is actually all Bs down. But to verify that, I
24 think that is in the actual rule language as the
25 declaration. So that was a lot of back and forth

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through this process.

2 MR. ESH: The compatibility categories is
3 something I wish I never learned.

4 (Laughter)

5 MR. SCHRUM: And who's got the
6 presentation? Would you mind putting it to 13, slide
7 13, please?

8 So you made an interesting comment here;
9 and again, it's early in this part of what we're going
10 through, but you said that this would be good for a
11 decision tree, decision process. If you have one site
12 that's starting to get into the level 3s above 500
13 millirem at a certain time frame, then a decision ought
14 to be made, that maybe that's not the best place for
15 the disposal of whatever the radionuclide is, whatever
16 the waste type is. That would also imply though that
17 the other facility has gone through the exact same
18 protocol, everything is exactly the same. And that I
19 don't believe your guidance will lead one facility to
20 do a PA exactly the same as the other facility.

21 And the defense-in-depth of course won't
22 be the same because they're in different locations.
23 That I appreciate, but it concerns me that a decision
24 would be made unless both facilities or both operations
25 are compared side-by-side. And all you're looking at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is the result. And maybe the analysis is flawed or
2 maybe the analysis didn't look at the same thing.
3 Could you clarify that a little bit for me?

4 MR. ESH: Right.

5 MR. SCHRUM: And then I'm --

6 MR. ESH: Yes, I understand your comment.
7 And the flexibility goes both ways, so if you afford
8 flexibility, then you don't necessarily ensure that
9 things are done identically from A to B. On the other
10 hand, even though you have flexibility, a lot of the
11 key elements we believe will put people in the same
12 playing field at least. One might be in right field
13 and one might in left field, but you're still on the
14 same baseball diamond.

15 So the challenge though as you indicated
16 would be say you're in that situation and you've wanted
17 to dispose of a certain type of waste and you're way
18 up there at level 3 or beyond and you're the only site
19 that analyzed it. Well, then that's the information
20 you have at the time to make the decision. If you don't
21 have the analysis of another site that shows they can
22 take that material, then of course you couldn't
23 necessarily factor that into the decision.

24 But in general the issue is this: Even if you're
25 moving to the WAC approach and this analysis-based

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 approach, you can always set concentration limits that
2 let you achieve a certain value. It might mean that
3 a certain waste stream you couldn't take if you set
4 those limits, but you can always set concentration
5 limits to manage what material goes where. So that
6 will factor into this whole protective assurance
7 analysis period and optimization/minimization
8 approach or optimization with a minimum target. That
9 would come into play.

10 But I understand your comment and make it
11 again formally and we'll work on it.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Yes,
13 sir?

14 MR. ZHU: Ming Zhu, DOE. I have question
15 about performance period, in the three-tier approach
16 you want to ensure protection for the long-term in the
17 performance period. In that period for certain waste
18 streams or waste types I can see that performance
19 calculations need to run for 10,000 years. For that
20 long period does the guidance provide specific
21 information about how to treat climate conditions? Do
22 you require consider of climate change quantitatively?

23 MR. ESH: Right. And in the guidance we
24 do talk about climate change. And what we basically
25 say for the long time frames is consider the climate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cycling in terms of the natural climate cycling, so the
2 big Milankovitch cycle and those that you expect that
3 increases say in precipitation or changes in
4 temperature, those sorts of things. But at this point
5 in time we don't tell people to speculate or try to
6 estimate the anthropogenic effects on climate because
7 especially -- basically for a lot of these waste
8 problems it boils down if you're reflecting the big
9 natural cycles, then the idea is that you're going to
10 capture the manmade cycles probably, because I think
11 the motion of the planets is probably a bigger effect
12 than what we're able to do to the system.

13 Sure there's a difference in timing of
14 those two things, but those longer time frames, it's
15 a softer calculation, or it should be. You're trying
16 to assess the best you can as engineers and scientists
17 what you think is going to happen, but anybody that
18 assigns more than an order of magnitude precision to
19 those results is fooling themselves. So you're just
20 kind of trying to see where you are and whether the
21 impacts you think are potentially problematic or not.
22 So, yes, the guidance document talk about the climate
23 cycling.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And,
25 yes, sir?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HARRINGTON: Chris Harrington from
2 Kurion. For the proposed rulemaking does it address
3 anything about transportation requirements if the
4 generator is one state and the disposal facility is
5 another?

6 MR. ESH: No.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Yomi, is anybody on
8 the phone?

9 OPERATOR: I'm showing no questions at
10 this time.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to John
12 Greeves.

13 MR. GREEVES: Several times when we've
14 talked about the earlier drafts the question of
15 grandfathering has come up. And at least one of the
16 sited states has been in business three going on four
17 decades. They've got 90 percent of their inventory in
18 place and they express concern about changes in this
19 rule which will become a burden on them . And they've
20 repeatedly asked the question is there a grandfather
21 provision? It was a big deal. You must have talked
22 about it. Will we find anything about grandfathering
23 in the rule or the guidance, and can you give us a little
24 entrée as to where that came out, either now or in future
25 meetings?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ESH: Right. We did not add any
2 provisions for grandfathering in the rule, in the
3 proposed rule that you'll see, because the idea was
4 there's at least one avenue that somebody could pursue
5 in that area where they could seek an exemption from
6 the provisions of the new regulation if they felt like
7 making some sort of argument like you just stated. So
8 I think there was another one, too, but I don't remember
9 it.

10 Chris, do you remember?

11 (No audible response)

12 MR. ESH: That was the main argument as to
13 why you didn't need to do it.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Do you want to
15 comment on that?

16 MR. GREEVES: My memory was there was
17 strong indication they wanted some clarity on that, so
18 future meetings I'm predicting you're going to get that
19 question.

20 MR. ESH: Well, there was a concern
21 expressed, but when we analyzed it and discussed it we
22 didn't agree with the concern, so --

23 MR. GREEVES: Well, that doesn't mean
24 you're not going to hear it again, and --

25 MR. ESH: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. GREEVES: -- I'm not speaking for
2 myself.

3 MR. ESH: Right, but now you're in the
4 proposed rule stage --

5 MR. GREEVES: Yes.

6 MR. ESH: -- where if you felt like you
7 voiced an opinion on something and we ignored you, voice
8 it again and you'll get a response to it --

9 MR. GREEVES: Well, I'm going to --

10 MR. ESH: -- because --

11 MR. GREEVES: -- voice the --

12 MR. ESH: -- anything that we got
13 information on, we feel like we have a good answer for,
14 so go ahead and make it again and we'll give you the
15 answer. You can see what our thought process was.

16 MR. GREEVES: Just as a place holder --

17 MR. ESH: Right.

18 MR. GREEVES: -- there's a concern about
19 people who have 90 percent of their inventory in place
20 and now they're going to be forced to do a site-specific
21 performance assessment, which is going to -- and you
22 have some numbers in here, millions of dollars.

23 MR. ESH: Right. But the issue partly is
24 this: Just because a site has 90 percent of its
25 inventory in place doesn't mean that they can't change

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their mind and expand their facility, take more
2 inventory.

3 MR. GREEVES: Right.

4 MR. ESH: And if they were under the
5 previous provisions, then they would not be meeting the
6 same criteria as anybody else would. So I mean, I
7 understand the concern. And like I say, that's an area
8 where anything that people felt like we didn't do a good
9 job addressing previous information, make your
10 comments and you'll get a response to it. And then you
11 can decide.

12 MR. GREEVES: I won't belabor the point.
13 I look further to further discussion. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Larry, do you want to add
15 something?

16 MR. CAMPER: I do. I do. You're right,
17 John, the State of South Carolina specifically
18 expressed that concern, for the record, and we did
19 discuss it with the State of South Carolina during the
20 course of developing this language. And we also
21 discussed this issue during different Commission
22 briefings, specific briefings that I held with each of
23 the commissioners in fact. And so the staff and the
24 Commission was aware of this.

25 We did discuss this grandfathering concept

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with the Office of General Counsel. They advised that
2 we could not do that. We did discuss the fact that if
3 you look at the language -- and as you know, when you
4 see the term "Commission" in a state has become an
5 Agreement State, that term "Commission" in many ways
6 becomes an interchangeable term.

7 The state can grant an exemption to this
8 regulation if it wants to, but that would be up to the
9 state to decide that. We could not find a public health
10 and safety basis for grandfathering or not having this
11 criteria apply to a particular state. And with regards
12 to the fact that the State of South Carolina does not
13 intend to take any more depleted uranium, apparently,
14 supposedly, that doesn't change the fact that the
15 source term is in the ground now and the closure
16 analysis has to be completed. So that has to be
17 accounted for even if nothing else is taken in the
18 future.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to Gary and
20 Lisa back here.

21 MR. ROBERTSON: Gary Robertson again.
22 And touching on John's point, South Carolina I believe
23 is about 80 percent complete with their covers, not only
24 90 percent of their inventory. But they, under what
25 I'm going to call good faith -- and here's the issue:

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If NRC can come along and change the rules after South
2 Carolina or Washington State has been inspected under
3 the IMPEP program, found to be compatible, their
4 performance assessment found to be acceptable with the
5 waste in the ground, and then you change the rules and
6 force a state that's -- 90 percent of the inventory is
7 already in the ground. They aren't going to accept any
8 new waste. I could see your point if they changed their
9 mind. They need to reevaluate. But if they keep to
10 what was agreed to, this is going to be problematic
11 especially in the future for anybody that is ever
12 thinking about putting a disposal site in a state
13 because there's always going to be that thought. Then
14 NRC will come back and change the ground rules.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's get -- well, I
16 want to get Larry's response to this. Okay? So, we'll
17 be back to you, Lisa, and then we'll go to John in the
18 back.

19 Larry, you heard the concern.

20 MR. CAMPER: Yes, thank you. We hear that
21 concern, and that's certainly a concern that we have
22 heard from the state and we do understand that, but I
23 would reemphasize that the state of South Carolina can
24 choose to grant an exemption to the operator of that
25 site of the state chooses to do so. The state can do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that. If the state decides that they want to allow the
2 operator, currently Energy Solutions, or any other
3 further operator to be exempt from these provisions
4 with regards to the performance assessment, they can
5 do that.

6 But also with regards to the State of South
7 Carolina I would remind us that just recently we've
8 heard conversation about the State of South Carolina
9 reopening consideration for taking class B and class
10 C waste and less class A. So I'm not sure that site
11 is as static as we might think otherwise. And time will
12 tell. We shall see.

13 But in the final analysis our view was that
14 these requirements are reasonable for every site, and
15 it could be up to the state to choose what it might
16 choose to do about granting an exemption.

17 MR. CAMERON: Gregory, do you want to add
18 to this and then we'll go to Lisa and then to John.
19 Gregory? Gregory Suber.

20 MR. SUBER: This is Gregory Suber. I just
21 wanted to make sure my understanding of something was
22 correct, and I think it will help in the conversation
23 moving forward.

24 David, you were making the point that
25 really the only new thing in the rule was the explicit

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requirement for an intruder assessment. Can you talk
2 a little bit about the fact that a technical evaluation
3 requirement was always in the rule and all the rule
4 really did was specify that that technical evaluation
5 would have to be a performance assessment?

6 And also go a little bit into how
7 defense-in-depth was always in the rule but now the
8 statement of this defense-in-depth is a little bit more
9 explicit? And if I'm wrong on that, correct me, but
10 that was my understanding.

11 MR. ESH: No, you're correct in the way
12 you're stating that. I mean, it isn't that the
13 intruder assessment is the only new piece. As we had
14 that performance assessment diagram and the things
15 around the outside, there are other things there, but
16 they're explicit things now as opposed to implicit. So
17 the previous performance assessments generally were
18 including all those things. Maybe not the 61.28, as
19 I think Dan Schrum had mentioned, the PA at closure,
20 but there are a few things like that that are more
21 process-oriented which are new.

22 And the other elements I'd say are not
23 changed specifically. They are added making things
24 explicit versus implicit. There was always a
25 requirement to do a technical analysis for a low-level

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 waste disposal facility. And as I understand South
2 Carolina; and they have undergone the IMPEP process,
3 you can look at the last IMPEP report, there was a
4 recommendation or something cited in there about how
5 they do their 61.41 evaluation. Because basically
6 they take the observed groundwater monitoring wells;
7 or at the time they were -- they took the observed
8 groundwater monitoring well concentrations and they
9 would use that to do their performance assessment,
10 which is not recognizing the inventory that's in the
11 system. It's only recognizing the inventory that's
12 come out of the system so far.

13 So that to me technically is the paying up
14 with their potential system, not the new requirements.
15 It's that maybe the way they interpreted the existing
16 requirements is problematic.

17 MR. CAMERON: You wanted to follow up,
18 Gary?

19 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, a quick response. I
20 think it's really important to use the data from your
21 groundwater monitoring to calibrate your performance
22 assessment and the assumptions that you've built into
23 it.

24 MR. ESH: Right.

25 MR. ROBERTSON: Hopefully they're doing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that. And I'm not from South Carolina, but --

2 MR. ESH: Right, and we aren't saying that
3 you shouldn't be using the information to calibrate,
4 but the information that you observe in the wells
5 doesn't necessarily represent what's going to come out
6 of your system. It only represents what has come out
7 so far. Those can be two completely different things,
8 especially for something like uranium.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to have
10 one more comment from Gary.

11 MR. ROBERTSON: And I'm not sure if South
12 Carolina is thinking this, but I know in Washington
13 State there wasn't a cover on some of these trenches
14 for 30-40 years. And by putting a cover on like South
15 Carolina has done, you would expect the numbers to
16 possibly go down. And I know there's the containment
17 and there's a lot of issues, but that may be a line of
18 thinking by them.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Lisa?

20 MS. EDWARDS: Lisa Edwards with EPRI. I
21 guess I'm a little confused. I thought this was an "or"
22 option, that there was nothing that drove you to have
23 to implement 61.58 and follow this whole process. You
24 could stick with the waste classification table and the
25 current system you're under, or you could go this route.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So if it's an undue burden, someone could just stay with
2 the process they're at. Am I missing something?

3 MR. ESH: No, 61.58 and the waste
4 classification is an "or," but everybody still needs
5 to demonstrate 61.42, which requires an intruder
6 analysis. So you're going to have to do an intruder
7 analysis. Whether you use the results of that intruder
8 analysis to develop your own waste concentrations at
9 your site, that's up to your choice. But you still have
10 to do the analysis and show that the dose limit is met.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's make sure that
12 that is clear to everybody. We're going to go to John
13 from Neptune.

14 MR. TOKES: John Tokes, Neptune Company.
15 I'm going to put on my civil engineer for a bit.
16 There's an analogy that comes to mind for me, and that's
17 building codes. If someone's refurbishing an old
18 building or continues to occupy and work on a building,
19 they've got to meet code. And if the codes change,
20 that's all for the public good. There's a reason
21 building codes are in place.

22 This last summer I had to replace the roof
23 on my house. And I went to the county and they said,
24 well, no, now the code is changed. You're going to have
25 to do some more stuff. And it ended up costing me

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 another \$5,000, but I have a better roof now. It meets
2 code, and I'm not objecting to that. I continue to
3 occupy my house. I want it to be safe. I want it to
4 not leak and that sort of thing.

5 So I think that's actually an appropriate
6 analogy here. You guys are writing the codes. And the
7 building codes change and everybody who owns a building
8 knows that codes may change from time to time and as
9 they maintain their building they got to keep it up to
10 code. So I think that analogy serves well here.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to John
12 Greeves. And then I want to check in with Yomi on the
13 phone. Maybe someone is on the phone from South
14 Carolina. Who knows? John?

15 MR. GREEVES: Yes, this is a healthy
16 discussion. There's going to be more meetings. But
17 it really comes back to the need for redline strikeout.
18 You're making changes. Dan Schrum asked a good
19 question, because the new rule is going to say at
20 closure you have to update. The old rule said
21 technical analysis. It didn't say performance
22 assessment. It just said technical analysis.

23 So we need the redline strikeout in this
24 question of somebody that's 90 percent through the
25 process, closed caps. What does the new rule add that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 makes their life miserable? And there's going to be
2 some more discussion about it. So again, I would
3 appreciate seeing redline strikeouts so we can be very
4 precise the next time we meet about the tension over
5 that topic. So, look forward to that. Thank you so
6 much.

7 MR. CAMERON: And as we noted, these
8 aren't formal comments on the proposed rule now, but
9 this discussion I think will be very helpful in terms
10 of guiding Larry and his staff for a future
11 collaborative process work shop in terms of issues. So
12 this is good.

13 Yomi, is there anybody on the phone?

14 OPERATOR: I'm showing no questions in
15 queue. Again, if you'd like to ask a question or state
16 a comment, please press star one and record your name.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

18 MR. SUBER: Chip, can I --

19 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

20 MR. SUBER: say something --

21 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, Gregory.

22 MR. SUBER: -- for John's benefit? Priya
23 Yadav, who has been working on this project for awhile
24 and who led the guidance development, has said that
25 there is a redline strikeouts version available. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would have to update that, but we can update that in
2 short term. And after the Commission FRN -- after the
3 official FRN comes out, we can update it and we can put
4 it on the Web site. So I think that would address John
5 and some other people's concerns.

6 MR. CAMERON: Good. Good. That's
7 great. Anybody else on the proposed rule? Anybody
8 want to say anything at this point?

9 (No audible response)

10 MR. CAMERON: And, Yomi, anybody on the
11 phone?

12 OPERATOR: No questions in queue.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, we're ahead of
14 schedule and maybe we should go to the branch
15 technical --

16 MR. SUBER: Yes, we can do that.

17 MR. CAMERON: -- position. And there was
18 one comment made to me during the break about the branch
19 technical position and the risks in the manifest. And
20 after we hear from Greg Suber on the BTP, Clint, you
21 can restate that for us. Okay?

22 Gregory Suber, Branch technical position.

23 MR. SUBER: All right. Thanks for the
24 introduction, Chip. And as Chip stated, my name is not
25 Christopher McKenney, so for those of you who are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 confused, make that clarification.

2 The first thing I'd like to do before I go
3 into my discussion of the implementation phase that we
4 have planned for the branch technical position on
5 concentration averaging is I would like to explicitly
6 thank my staff. This has been an extremely productive
7 quarter for us. We have been able to issue a lot of
8 things that we have been working on for a number of
9 years, Part 61 being one of them. But also the branch
10 technical position on concentration averaging and the
11 risks on the uniform waste manifest.

12 So I know Priya Yadav is on the line. She
13 did a lot of work on Part 61. So did Mr. Christopher
14 Grossman. So I'd like to thank them for their hard
15 word. Mr. Don Loman and Karen Pinkston led the effort
16 of issuing the risk on the uniform waste manifest. And
17 the presentation that I'm going to give right now and
18 the update of the branch technical position on
19 concentration averaging is a result of work done by Mr.
20 James Kennedy, Dr. Christian Ridge, Mr. Maurice Heath
21 and again Mr. Donald Loman. So first I'd like to
22 acknowledge them before I move forward.

23 Okay. On February 25th the BTP was issued
24 and it was issued in the Federal Register. It has been
25 broken up into two volumes. The first volume is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 revision of the technical positions that the staff has
2 revised, but the second volume consists of the summary
3 and the addressment of the stakeholder comments that
4 we received, and also an explanation of the technical
5 basis for the BTP. One of the big criticisms of the
6 previous version was that a lot of people didn't
7 understand what the technical basis were for the
8 staff's positions. So we went through the effort of
9 trying to justify and explain the technical basis for
10 the BTP, and you'll find that in the second volume.

11 The other thing I'd like to say is that the
12 staff did what I consider an unprecedented amount of
13 public outreach when we revised the BTP. We came out
14 with a series of public meetings. After we had the
15 public meetings we issued a draft. And we got comments
16 on the draft and we were asked to allow the people who
17 commented on the draft to see the next version of our
18 draft. So we actually issued a second version of the
19 BTP and enabled people to comment on that. And that
20 was pretty out of process, but it shows our level of
21 commitment in trying to address the many concerns that
22 were raised as we revised this document.

23 The basis of the reorganization was for a
24 number of reasons. One I already hit on. People
25 complained about the readability and the ability to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 understand the previous version of the BTP. So that
2 was a major driver for us revising the document. In
3 addition, we tried to make the document a little bit
4 more risk-informed. And we tried to remove some of the
5 conservatisms in some of the positions, and in doing
6 so we were able to do things like remove the fact of
7 10 constraints on mixing of blendable waste, and we also
8 revised the application of the factor of 2 and the
9 factor of 10 for discrete items.

10 One thing that was most noteworthy was the
11 increase in the limit for the disposal of cesium-137
12 sealed sources. Sealed sources present a significant
13 problem, especially from a security perspective and we
14 got a lot of very positive comments, especially from
15 our sister regulators at NNSA for the work that we did
16 on sealed sources.

17 The other thing was the work that we did
18 on alternative approaches. So what the position does
19 now is allow people the flexibility to use alternative
20 approaches when they're doing their concentration
21 averaging.

22 We're now in a phase of implementing the
23 BTP and we're about to go on a series of training. Now,
24 the goal of the training is to address those who are
25 going to inspect against the branch technical position.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So that would include the materials inspectors in the
2 regions, the inspectors at the nuclear power plant
3 sites, and also in the Agreement States.

4 Now, our purpose is twofold: First of
5 all, we want people to optimize the use of the BTP. But
6 secondly, we want the inspection efforts associated
7 with the BTP to be consistent across the country. And
8 if everyone has the same understanding, if everyone
9 receives the same training, then hopefully the
10 implementation of the inspection program associated
11 with that will be consistent across the country and
12 people will actually be able to optimize the use of the
13 BTP.

14 So we're starting with our inspectors in
15 Region I and we hope to actually perform that training
16 at the end of April. We're trying to accelerate our
17 inspection schedule. As a matter of fact, I was trying
18 to work out an arrangement with Rusty before he left
19 today of getting to Utah and training Utah sometime in
20 the first week in May.

21 Now in addition to going out and engaging
22 the inspectors on training, we're also trying to come
23 up with a plan; and we'll be more than welcome to take
24 your comments or your suggestions, on how we can help
25 educate the industry or help explain the various

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 positions to the industry so that they will be clear,
2 and so once again we can optimize or maximize the use
3 of the BTP.

4 So once again, as I've explained, the BTP
5 is available finally, and that probably cuts down 90
6 percent of the questions that I get asked when I make
7 these presentations. The first one is when is Part 61
8 coming out? And it's out. Okay. And the second one
9 is when is the staff going to issue the BTP? So I would
10 not be surprised if I don't get any questions, Chip,
11 seeing that we have been very productive. Well, you
12 know, hope springs eternal, right? Seeing that we have
13 been very productive.

14 MR. CAMERON: All right. We've got a
15 question, and will go to Bob Halstead after Billy.
16 Billy?

17 MR. COX: Yes, Billy Cox. I represent
18 myself. I guess I'd like to thank the staff for the
19 work on the BTP. I agree that it was a very fruitful
20 and iterative process, and I think in the end we got
21 a reasonable product. So looks pretty good.

22 Actually the question kind of came to my
23 mind before you asked it, but I know that you folks are
24 going to do training outreach to the states and your
25 staff, and you kind of asked the question about maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you're looking for suggestions on how we might be able
2 to do that with some of the industry. And I guess what
3 I was thinking was; I don't know if it's possible,
4 probably not, for industry people to attend some of the
5 trainings that you're doing. But depending on the
6 length of it, it might also be something that could be
7 tagged on the end of a conference that EPRI might
8 organize or maybe on the end of this symposia that just
9 passed.

10 MR. SUBER: That is a good comment. In
11 fact, we are definitely on schedule to do a presentation
12 at the upcoming EPRI conference I believe in June. So,
13 we have already started working with the various
14 organizations to schedule the training.

15 We know we will probably talk. We will
16 probably do something with the Low-Level Waste Forum.
17 It is likely that we will do something with the RadWaste
18 Summit. It won't be to the extent that the Inspector
19 training is. I mean, that is a different role that we
20 have when we are engaging our Inspectors. But we
21 definitely want to hear your ideas on what information
22 we should disseminate. As we are developing our
23 presentations, we will take that into consideration.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Bob? Bob
25 Halstead.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HALSTEAD: Thank you.

2 Bob Halstead, State of Nevada.

3 I am going to embarrass myself asking this
4 question because some of our staff who had to leave
5 earlier probably know where this information is.

6 But we have been real sensitive because of
7 the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and other areas
8 related to disposal of sealed sources at Area 5 at NNSS
9 and that whole area. I guess the question is, is there
10 somewhere in the regulatory analysis or somewhere, some
11 numbers about the actual inventory of cesium-137 sealed
12 sources that the new limits might apply to or any
13 information on the distribution of the number of
14 sources within activity categories?

15 Again, forgive me for asking because I know
16 we have got people on the NDEP staff that I can ask when
17 I get home. But, while I am here, I thought I should
18 ask the question.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Chris?

20 Are we going to Chris on this one?

21 MR. SUBER: Yes, I was, but Chris is now
22 looking at me.

23 (Laughter.)

24 Okay. Yes, right. DOE is probably
25 the -- Martin, what are you doing, man?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Laughter.)

2 I will defer to my counterparts in DOE.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And just
4 please introduce yourself.

5 MR. MARTIN: I will. No, I'm David
6 Martin.

7 The reason I sat silent is because I am a
8 contractor with DOE. I do not speak for DOE, but I will
9 give you just some factual information. So, I want to
10 be careful about that.

11 I think the question was, is there an
12 inventory of the sources that will, then, fall under
13 I guess the new limits for cesium and maybe the
14 alternative approaches? We know that Category 1 and
15 2 sources are in the NSTS. So, obviously, a lot of
16 those are cesium and a lot of those would fall under
17 those limits.

18 There is also a voluntary registry that Los
19 Alamos does for the Offsite Source Recovery Project.
20 There is also a list with that. It is voluntary,
21 though. And so, it is just likely a fraction of what
22 is out there.

23 Whether or not any of that is publicly
24 available, I just don't know the answer to that, but
25 those are the two sources.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Do you want to add?

2 Okay.

3 MR. HALSTEAD: Thank you.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: You got it, Bob?

5 MR. HALSTEAD: Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Before we go to
7 Lisa, Bob used a term that may be helpful for people.
8 He used the term "regulatory analysis". Is there one
9 for the proposed rule?

10 MR. SUBER: Yes, there is a
11 regulatory -- do you mean for Part 61?

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

13 MR. SUBER: Yes, there is, but we usually
14 don't make the regulatory analysis public. So, the
15 purpose of the regulatory analysis is to take, to use
16 this term loosely, a cost/benefit look at the
17 rulemaking. And there is a regulatory analysis, but
18 it is not public. Okay?

19 It sounded like I had a question, but okay.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Just for
21 everybody's information.

22 Lisa?

23 MS. EDWARDS: Gregory, first of all, thank
24 you for the presentation. Thank you very much for the
25 BTP. I always say the proof is in the pudding. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when you read the BTP, it clearly reflects that a great
2 deal of the feedback that was provided in these and
3 other forums was actually analyzed and incorporated to
4 a very large extent. So, I really appreciate that.

5 I couldn't help but notice, and I am quite
6 interested in, the Implementation Plan. Larry and I
7 have had some discussions. Industry is a little
8 missing off of that list, but EPRI is funding a project
9 over the next year or so to develop some implementation
10 guidance related to the BTP. That is not to suggest
11 at all that I think it is poorly-written. I think it
12 is actually quite well-written. But we all know that,
13 when six people read the same paragraph, they do not
14 come away with one interpretation of the paragraph.

15 So, the Implementation Guide is basically,
16 in a nutshell, designed to go through each section of
17 the BTP, kind of summarize what it says and what this
18 means, how you would apply it, provide some additional
19 illustrations perhaps.

20 Discussions of the alternative approaches
21 would be the second section in terms of what are the
22 technical considerations you want to keep in mind to
23 determine if an alternative approach applies to your
24 particular situation or does not apply, and as many
25 examples as we can drum up from across the industry of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 application of the alternative approaches.

2 The last one, which may be of interest
3 early, probably will be obsolete fairly soon, is the
4 comparison of the new BTP to the old BTP and an analysis
5 maybe of what the difference is.

6 So, I think the most important element of
7 this project is who is on the Committee. The hope is
8 that the Committee will be comprised of five to ten
9 plant folks, the generators, representation from the
10 expert shipping folks. In fact, Tom Kalinowski with
11 DW James will be our principal investigator on this and
12 will actually be writing the guidance, in conjunction
13 with the Committee.

14 Also, disposal site operators; and then,
15 very importantly, we would like to get representation
16 from the four agreement states that have a disposal site
17 and from the NRC staff, to kind of start from the
18 generator, go through the shippers and the disposal
19 site operators to the regulators that are overseeing
20 and implementing this process.

21 So, perhaps this effort, if you
22 participate -- and I surely hope you will -- could be
23 part of your Implementation Plan for free.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. SUBER: That's great. And I am sure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we are able to participate in that kind of -- okay, yes,
2 so we would be more than happy to send a representative.
3 And if not, then you have got to hire Jim Kennedy in
4 six weeks because he will no longer be with the NRC,
5 but a retired annuitant.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, Yomi, is
7 anybody on the phone for us?

8 OPERATOR: There are no questions at this
9 time.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to
11 Clint, and this is, I think, the manifest risk, the
12 whole concern that you had. Go ahead, and please
13 introduce yourself.

14 MR. MILLER: Clint Miller, Pacific Gas
15 and Electric.

16 Again, I would like to commend the NRC on
17 getting all of these things out of triple play, I guess.
18 Got the BTP out, the RIS on the manifest, and the
19 proposed rule, in my notes, I guess in reverse-order
20 here.

21 So, I would encourage NRC, now that the BTP
22 is out, that in my view this makes clear that you really
23 don't classify waste until it is in the final package.
24 I believe that means that, out there for us in the
25 regular community, your colleagues in NRR, Reg Guide

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 1.21 still requires us to submit annual rad effluent
2 reports. And the solid waste reporting on that
3 currently in Rev 2 out there says you have to count the
4 shipments that go from your power plant or generation
5 site to a waste processor and state the waste
6 classification of that. So, I think that is in
7 conflict.

8 And NEI and industry have provided
9 comments. We have been waiting for a while for 1.21
10 to be revised. So, we appreciate that, with this out,
11 maybe that will spur that effort to get that revised
12 and consider comments there.

13 But, turning back to the proposed rule on
14 61 --

15 MR. SUBER: Clint, can I respond to that --

16 MR. MILLER: Sure, sure.

17 MR. SUBER: -- real quick before I forget
18 the answer? Okay.

19 We are actually, now that the rule is out
20 in draft form, and now that we have issued the RIS, we
21 are going to proceed to update NUREG/BR-0204, which
22 deals with the waste shipment manifest. In that
23 process, it will probably be the right arena for you
24 to bring up the concerns about the inconsistency that
25 you see between the manifest and the Reg Guides and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those requirements.

2 MR. MILLER: Very good. Yes, that
3 answers part of my second one. So, thanks for that.

4 Yes, point 1 was Reg Guide 1.21. We need
5 the revision from this.

6 Going back to the proposed rule on 61, we
7 appreciate that the classification tables are still
8 there because we, as waste packagers, even though a
9 disposal site may be open with its own individual WAC,
10 at any day we could lose access to that site. So, it
11 is very important that we have those classification
12 tables around.

13 I guess some of this is timing, and that
14 would be the NRC Strategic Policy where all our guidance
15 is spread across many items. So, I believe the
16 Commission asked to look at the values in those
17 classification tables. I believe that is going to
18 happen in a separate track. We look forward to input
19 on that.

20 With regard to the manifesting issue on the
21 BR-0204, I believe, ASME had submitted comments beyond
22 just the certification issue, but also mentioned some
23 items on precision that we have put in the manifest.
24 I think that has become a timely topic with some recent
25 Part 37 inspections, where we get to do the calculation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for activity.

2 We get a factor of 1.5 on gamma emitters.
3 We get a factor of 10 on difficult-to-measure emitters.
4 And some of us have made some errors. We report them
5 in our CAP program. But, you know, a couple curies here
6 or there, and 65 curies or 150 curies doesn't affect
7 waste class, doesn't affect shipping type, but it can
8 affect if you are going to be Cat 2 radioactive
9 material.

10 We are looking at some issues there about
11 what level of finding is that, if we make that error,
12 and is it really an error? I mean, we do the best we
13 can with the numbers we have. So, it is something to
14 think about on precision that we manifest because we
15 are now being held to that standard.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. SUBER: Okay. all right.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Clint.

19 Greg, are you going to respond to anything?
20 Do you have anything to say in terms of the issues Clint
21 raised?

22 MR. SUBER: Not to the last issues,
23 because I think you are referring to Part 37, correct?
24 The precision on the waste manifest?

25 MR. MILLER: Because Part 37, it is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requiring perhaps more precision on our part than we
2 would have in a regular waste classification and
3 shipping typification.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

5 MR. SUBER: Yes, we will look into it.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Good.

7 Let's go to Tom Magette.

8 MR. MAGETTE: Thank you.

9 Tom Magette, Pricewaterhouse Coopers.

10 I think it sounds like we have two really
11 good things happening post-new-BTP in terms of what the
12 NRC is planning for training of Inspectors and the
13 working group that EPRI plans on empaneling. I am just
14 really curious to see how different the two things they
15 might come up with would look.

16 I have been concerned about that all along.
17 I know there is some concern about industry
18 participation and our NRC training. But it seems to
19 me that one NRC person on that panel might not really
20 go far enough to make sure that the new interpretation
21 by the various people that are going to have to be
22 implementing the new guidance are, in fact, the same,
23 and not even just really close, but the same.

24 Otherwise, I foresee a lot of difficulty.
25 It is a brand-new document. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 six-people-reading-the-same-paragraph issue I think
2 is very real. So, I would like to see a little bit of
3 some more cross-fertilization between the industry and
4 the NRC before the training starts.

5 And I know you guys are trying to get out
6 there quickly, and I appreciate that. I appreciate the
7 need for that because you are talking about a guidance
8 document that, in fact, carries the weight of a license
9 requirement because of the way it is incorporated in
10 the disposal site licenses. So, certainly, timeliness
11 is an issue.

12 But I do think I don't hear enough
13 coordination. I mean, I would love to see them be
14 together. By that, I mean training of people that are
15 going to be actually packaging waste and accepting it
16 for disposal as well as people that are going to be
17 inspecting to make sure that they have the same
18 understanding.

19 I have heard from you guys, when I have
20 asked this, that that is a problem. But, to me, if
21 there is not some way to bridge that, then we are going
22 to have a lot of inconsistency for a while.

23 Thank you.

24 Well, one thing that could help us, if we
25 could at least see the slides that you guys are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 developing for your training exercise, so that EPRI
2 could actually put them into their document.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Do you think that
4 would be possible, Greg?

5 MR. SUBER: Did you want to handle it?

6 MR. CAMPER: I was going to comment about
7 this as a sum-up. But we certainly recognize the
8 operational reality that takes place every day,
9 particularly in the nuclear power plants as they go
10 about using the BTP. So, we will look for
11 opportunities to interface with industry and share
12 information and get reactions firsthand to that
13 guidance.

14 On the one hand, we have to maintain an
15 arm's length and the integrity of the inspection
16 process and not have industry participating in training
17 of our Inspectors, for the obvious reasons, I would
18 daresay. But, on the other hand, there will be
19 opportunities and ways, Tom, to make that sort of thing
20 that you are getting happen. Lisa and I have discussed
21 it. Participation in that panel is one thing, but
22 specific opportunities to sit down and train and
23 exchange information, we will look for ways to do that.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yomi, anybody on
25 the phone?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 OPERATOR: We are showing no questions in
2 queue.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And we have
4 nothing on the webinar. Okay.

5 Anybody else have any comments on BTP, Part
6 61, anything at all?

7 Okay, let's go to this gentleman.

8 MR. NOLAN: Mike Nolan, Energy Northwest.

9 Just one quick comment. A lot of
10 representatives in here from the vetter community, some
11 folks from the power plant community. I would just
12 recommend that, as this training gets rolled out, you
13 don't forget the non-nuclear power plant generators
14 because they have just as much a stake in this as anybody
15 else.

16 MR. SUBER: Right. Thank you.
17 Excellent point.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.
19 Anybody?

20 (No response.)

21 Okay, one final check with Yomi. Yomi,
22 anybody on the phone?

23 OPERATOR: I am showing no questions in
24 the queue.

25 Participants, I would remind you, please

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 press *1 and record your name if you would like to ask
2 a question.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, we will just
4 give that a second to see if anybody is going to press
5 *1. And then, I think we will go to Larry for closing
6 comments.

7 Did anybody respond to that, Yomi?
8 Anybody on?

9 OPERATOR: No questions at this time.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

11 Larry?

12 MR. CAMPER: Thank you, Chip.

13 I thank all of you for being here today.
14 Thank you for your excellent comments. Staff will go
15 back and review the transcript and look carefully at
16 everything that has been said.

17 I, from my perspective as the Division
18 Director, have found your input to be extremely useful,
19 and it will aid us as we plan the next public meeting.
20 So, thank you for that input.

21 Since we are on the record, I want to make
22 a few comments in closing. I always like to kind of
23 share with you what I hear coming from the Division
24 Director perspective, but also it is important because
25 others will read this transcript. Members of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public will read this transcript, people who weren't
2 here, people who are maybe not quite as familiar with
3 some of the workings as you. So, it is important that
4 a few things be made from my perspective for the record.

5 First, the Site-Specific Performance
6 Assessment rulemaking and the other changes that we
7 have that are associated with it, such as the guidance,
8 will, in fact, enhance the disposal of large quantities
9 of depleted uranium and other long-lived radionuclides
10 that weren't necessarily specifically addressed at the
11 time Part 61 was created years ago.

12 We have developed the guidance that will
13 be necessary to implement this rule. You saw a copy
14 of it earlier. It is extensive, but the rule does have
15 adequate guidance, as the Commission directed us to do.

16 Speaking of the Commission, clearly, there
17 is a great deal of interest in this rulemaking by the
18 Commission and, for that matter, I would say there is
19 a great deal of interest by the Commission in waste
20 issues in general. We get asked a lot of questions by
21 the Commission offices. The Commission deliberated on
22 this rulemaking extensively. I mentioned in my
23 opening comments we got three sets of direction from
24 the Commission. So, the Commission is aware. The
25 Commission is interested. I know some of you do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 drop-in visits with the Commissioners. So, do know
2 that it is on their minds.

3 We will be holding more public meetings.
4 We will get a schedule out. Greg and his staff will
5 work on that soon. We will address the rule. We will
6 address the guidance. Yes, John, we will provide a
7 redline/strikeout. (Laughter.) And we do agree with
8 the value of it.

9 I want to point out that the waste
10 classification system in 61.55, the two tables that are
11 there are not changed as a result of this rulemaking.
12 Those waste classification tables, as you know, have
13 been used successfully for years. They were built
14 around protecting the inadvertent intruder,
15 particularly from cesium-137. Those tables don't go
16 away. The ore component applies to being able to use
17 a Waste Acceptance Criteria if the licensee wants to.
18 But those screening values in 61.55 remain.

19 I would point out, though, that it is
20 important, as you do your review of this regulation,
21 to bear in mind that the staff does have another
22 assignment before it that we have been specifically
23 directed to do by a previous Commission, but not to do
24 until such time as this ongoing rulemaking is complete.

25 And that assignment was to update the waste

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 classification scheme, bringing to bear current ICRP
2 methodologies and, in particular, to determine the
3 class of waste for depleted uranium.

4 I think it is important, when you look at
5 this rulemaking and the fact that the Commission has
6 now proceeded to require or is in the midst of a
7 proceeding to require the use of a Site-Specific
8 Performance Assessment, you could comment as to the
9 efficacy, the need for, the value of that subsequent
10 direction which the Commission has given to the staff.

11 I raise that because at the time that that
12 direction was given to the staff, we didn't have, the
13 Commission didn't have in place, then, the
14 Site-Specific Performance Assessment that this rule
15 will put in place to address the disposal of large
16 quantities of depleted uranium.

17 So, the staff would find value in views
18 provided as to the efficacy or need for that subsequent
19 rulemaking, so we can communicate with the Commission
20 at a future date about that particular assignment.

21 I want you to think holistically. I
22 mentioned that in my opening comments. I want to
23 reiterate it here. We would like for you to review the
24 proposed rule and please comment. We would like for
25 you to review the guidance and please comment. But you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 also need to examine the concentration averaging BTP
2 that was recently finalized that Greg just shared with
3 you in his comments.

4 You also need to review the Regulatory
5 Information Summary that we put out recently, in
6 February, to address the Phantom 4. That is the
7 so-called Phantom 4 isotopes, tritium, carbon-14,
8 I-129, and tech-99.

9 It is important that you do that and look
10 at all these things together because they all impact
11 operations day-to-day on the management and disposal
12 of low-level waste. As you look at those documents
13 holistically, if you see something in the RIS and you
14 go, "Hmm, why did they do that when they are doing
15 that?", or you see something in the BTP and you say,
16 "Does that make sense now that I see the proposed
17 rulemaking?" -- we can always continue to improve
18 things. So, look at it all when you do your review of
19 the regulation and, also, of the guidance document.

20 Ultimately, as Greg said, part of our plan
21 is to make certain modifications to the manifest that
22 accompanies the disposal of waste as part of our
23 finalization of this rule. We will also, then, update
24 NUREG/BR-0204. The RIS dealing with the Phantom 4 was
25 an interim step, so that there could be guidance out

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there, particularly guidance with regards to the use
2 of scaling factors to address accounting for those four
3 radionuclides.

4 So, ultimately, as you look at this rule,
5 bear in mind that there will be some adjustments to the
6 shipping manifest and, ultimately, a revision to that
7 particular NUREG. So, do look at the big picture.

8 I will tell you that not only is there a
9 lot of Commission interest in this, but, as I speak,
10 we, the staff, are working with SECY to plan a
11 Commission briefing on the Part 61 rulemaking. There
12 will be a separate briefing on the low-level waste
13 decommissioning business-wide, but, first, there will
14 be a briefing on this rulemaking. The Commission wants
15 to have that. Tentatively, that will take place in
16 June. That could change. But, again, the Commission
17 is very interested in this rulemaking and is very
18 interested in waste issues.

19 I want to make it very clear for the members
20 of the public, in particular. I know that you all know
21 this, as industry practitioners, but for those who read
22 this transcript or follow in public meetings. Nothing
23 in this rulemaking should be interpreted by members of
24 the public that the existing Part 61 is not adequate
25 to protect public health and safety.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Similarly, no one should question whether
2 or not the four sites that are currently operating, the
3 four commercial sites that are operating in Washington,
4 South Carolina, Utah, and Texas, they are, in fact,
5 being operated safely.

6 We had some discussion here about some
7 concerns about one of those states with regards to the
8 provisions in this rulemaking because of the status of
9 their site at this point in time. But those sites, all
10 four of them, have and are operating safely. It is
11 important to the public to know that.

12 This rulemaking, rather, will enhance the
13 current regulations to fully address the disposal of
14 large quantities of depleted uranium that wasn't
15 envisioned at the time Part 61 was created. And
16 similarly, it will ensure that certain long-lived
17 radionuclides are fully and completely addressed in the
18 rule language.

19 This rulemaking, similarly, will fully
20 protect the inadvertent intruder by requiring an
21 assessment and by imposing a dose limit. Protection
22 of the inadvertent intruder has always been there at
23 61.42, and sites are designed to protect the
24 inadvertent intruder. What this rule does is make it
25 explicitly clear, not implicitly present.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There is a relationship with what is going
2 on internationally in this rule. I pointed out earlier
3 that the Commission put an emphasis upon
4 defense-in-depth plus performance assessment equals
5 safety case. We have always done a safety case; we have
6 just not called it a safety case. A safety case is an
7 IAEA, the International Atomic Energy Agency,
8 nomenclature used in its guidance and standards.

9 So, we think it is a positive thing that
10 there is more alignment or more consideration of an
11 international concept. I mean, radioactive waste is
12 radioactive waste. The IAEA has a different waste
13 classification system. It works very well. Ours
14 works very well. But this is a bit of an alignment
15 around what goes on internationally, and that is not
16 a bad thing.

17 We do plan to have discussions
18 specifically around the proposed rule with the
19 agreement states, those four agreement states that have
20 the operating sites within their jurisdiction. It is
21 very important, not only for the reasons raised, the
22 concerns, by the State of North Carolina, but all four
23 states.

24 Given that they are the states that
25 actually have the operating sites, it is very, very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 important they provide comments to the staff and that
2 they fully understand the contents of the rule. And
3 so, we will specifically reach out and interface with
4 the agreement states.

5 Bob Halstead, is he still here? Yes, Bob.
6 Bob asked a question about the waste out there that is
7 possible for being disposed of at these sites. I think
8 earlier in our comments today and the opening remarks
9 we commented on the BTP, that for cesium-137 the sealed
10 source strength that could be disposed of goes from 30
11 curies to 130 curies.

12 I want to emphasize again for the record
13 that that is based upon a much more realistic health
14 physics scenario. When you look at the background in
15 the BTP, you will see that previously the assumptions
16 that went into the limit of 30 curies were, arguably,
17 unnecessarily conservative. I mean, it assumed
18 contact with the source for 2350 hours. That is just
19 not realistic.

20 So, we used a much more realistic health
21 physics scenario. That is why that dramatic increase.
22 And believe, I explained that in considerable detail
23 to our previous Chairman Allison Macfarlane because she
24 wanted an answer to that question.

25 It is a big year. It is a very big year

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for what we do on the waste front. Part 61 rulemaking,
2 concentration averaging BTP implementation, GTCC,
3 Greater Than Class C waste, and the communication that
4 we will be having with our Commission in the May/June
5 timeframe.

6 We are currently in the midst of updating
7 our Low-Level Waste Strategic Assessment. A year ago
8 in this meeting we had a panel. We got input about what
9 should we be spending our time and energy and limited
10 resources on strategically over the next five years.

11 We did the LLWSA, the Low-Level Waste
12 Strategic Assessment, back in 2007, but, obviously, the
13 world changes. The dynamics of our industry are
14 different. The considerations that we have to be
15 focused upon are different.

16 So, we will be putting out an updated
17 Strategic Assessment for awareness and comment, I think
18 that is in July. Greg, is that when it is?

19 MR. SUBER: June or July.

20 MR. CAMPER: It is in that timeframe? It
21 will be this summer, let's say.

22 And then, of course, the Phantom 4
23 Regulatory Information Summary, do take a look at that.
24 Lisa Edwards from EPRI gave a presentation at our
25 Regulatory Information Conference a couple of weeks

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ago, and I was very pleased to see that the work that
2 our staff had done did align with the analyses that had
3 been performed by EPRI. And so, we got a scientific
4 gut check there, if you will. That is a good thing.

5 So, do observe. There is a lot going on.
6 Do be involved. We know you will.

7 Thanks for coming today.

8 And thanks to my staff. It has been an
9 absolute pleasure to work with the staff on all these
10 issues over the last three or four years. They have
11 done a great job.

12 Thank you for your input.

13 (Applause.)

14 (Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the meeting was
15 adjourned.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2