

RulemakingForm2CEm Resource

From: Sally Shaw [acer8sac@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:41 PM
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Comment on Waste Rules: Docket ID NRC-2011-0012

I am very interested in the rules that the NRC makes to govern low level nuclear waste, especially since so much of that waste ends up in our backyards.

I have some significant concerns about the proposed revisions to Part 61, but first wanted to express my support for one part: The proposed revisions appear to allow states to maintain their reliance upon classification tables, for example to enforce bans on Class B&C wastes. Thank you for including that in the final rules. States must have the right to keep hotter wastes out, if they violate state laws.

There are several key concerns that I'd like to highlight.

1. The new regulations reduce the compliance period. At first staff chose a 10,000 year period, but that's been reduced to only 1,000 years. This is less protective of public health and the environment. It may be hard to look so far ahead, but we owe it to future generations to give them the tools to ensure safety.
2. We are concerned that licensees (such as EnergySolutions) can choose to simply order a study if they want to bring a new waste stream. This move towards the WAC approach has the potential to transfer decision-making power to consultants and overwhelm states with complex models.
3. Next, I disagree with the dramatic limitations placed on the number of intruder scenarios to be considered. This approach is not appropriate for long-lived nuclear waste streams that will require more advanced predictive modeling. Just looking at scenarios happening now is absurdly restrictive given the potential for harm for millennia. State and federal regulators must be able to require state of the art protections at any time in the future.
4. Finally, I request that the NRC classify Depleted Uranium. As a unique waste stream that continues to grow more radioactive for 2.1 million years, it makes no sense to arbitrarily lump it into the Class A category -- with waste that's only hazardous for a few hundred years. I urge the NRC to finally classify this waste accurately to inform ongoing disposal efforts.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sally Shaw
100 River Rd.
Gill, MA 01354

Federal Register Notice: 80FR16081,NRC-2011-0012
Comment Number: 177

Mail Envelope Properties (1272333728.31271.1436319650549.JavaMail.tomcat)

Subject: [External_Sender] Comment on Waste Rules: Docket ID NRC-2011-0012
Sent Date: 7/7/2015 9:40:50 PM
Received Date: 7/7/2015 9:40:51 PM
From: Sally Shaw

Created By: acer8sac@comcast.net

Recipients:
"RulemakingComments Resource" <RulemakingComments.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: vweb209

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2164	7/7/2015 9:40:51 PM

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