

From: Jim Lieberman <jxlr@comcast.net>
To: <nrcprep@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 4, 2006 10:46 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1854 -Docket Nos.: PROJ0734, PORJ0735, PROJ0736, and POOM-32

Please accept the attached comments for the above matter.

Jim Lieberman
jxlr@comcast.com
John Greeves
greevesj@aol.com

CC: <ahb1@nrc.gov>

5/31/04

71 FR 30967

11

RECEIVED

2006 AUG -4 AM 10:50

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

SUNSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RFDs = ADM-03
Call = A. Moulford
(AHB1)

Mail Envelope Properties (44D35DBD.86A : 16 : 2154)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1854 -Docket Nos.: PROJ0734, PORJ0735, PROJ0736, and POOM-32
Creation Date Fri, Aug 4, 2006 10:45 AM
From: Jim Lieberman <jxlrc@comcast.net>
Created By: jxlrc@comcast.net

Recipients

nrc.gov
 TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
 NRCREP

nrc.gov
 OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
 AHB1 CC (Anna Bradford)

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
 OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov
 nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	122	Friday, August 4, 2006 10:45 AM

submitted letter to NRC on SRP 8-4-06.doc	45056
Mime.822	63325

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
 This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
 Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
 Junk List is not enabled

Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled

August 4, 2006

SUBMITTED BY E-MAIL

Anna Bradford
Project Manager Waste Determinations
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C 20555

Subject: Docket Nos.: PROJ0734, PORJ0735, PROJ0736, and POOM-32
Comments on Draft NRC SRP for Activities Related to US DOE Waste
Determinations (NUREG -1854)

Enclosed please find our comments on the above NUREG which was noticed for

comment in the Federal Register on May 31, 2006. These comments are in addition to the comments that we previously submitted to the NRC on concentration averaging which we understand are being considered by the NRC and, therefore, do not need to be resubmitted.

We are available to discuss these comments at your convenience if you would find that helpful.

Sincerely,

John Greeves
greevesj@aol.com

Jim Lieberman
jxlrc@comcast.net

enc. As stated

Comments on Draft NUREG-1854, SRP for Activities Related to US DOE Waste Determinations

Overall, we find that this document should be a helpful document for the consistency of
the ~~environment~~. In general, the document is well written and balanced in its approach

to meeting responsibilities under section 3116. For example, the discussions on highly radioactive radionuclides and maximum extent practical are well done. However, a few areas go beyond what appears to be a reasonable approach. For example, section 10 Monitoring should be focused on measurements that indicate overall performance of the facility, similar to monitoring performed at other contaminated sites. The current section may go well beyond what is reasonable under the provisions of the NDAA.

We offer the following specific comments for consideration and clarification:

1) Page 1-9 line 12 NRC should also reference the 2000 Waste Determination review for SRS.

2) Page 4-7 line 22 This should address the consistency of the buffer zone with the

NRC will have a role in regulating the outcome of a West Valley Waste Determination once the license is reinstated. Considering the factors for compliance with the performance objectives when reviewing the West Valley determination would seem appropriate if it is the NRC intent to rely on it when the license is reinstated. In this way the NRC staffs developing the factors are fully aware of the determination and its basis.

Section 10 Monitoring

NRC monitoring is clearly required, however, this section appears to go beyond what is intended under the NDAA.

6) Page 10-1 line 25

The West Valley site should be included and is a good example of how monitoring can and should be performed. The WVDA calls for Commission to monitor the activities for the purpose of assuring the public health and safety. This is similar to the role under the NDAA. NRC staff has been

monitoring the West Valley site under the act for over 25 years. Each year an environmental report is prepared and

provided to NRC that includes environmental data for the

to monitor. How would NRC propose to monitor these topics?

7) Page 10-2 line33

The NDAA has no requirements for DOE to submit a plan for monitoring to the NRC. However, DOE as the designer of the tank closure system is in the best position to design the monitoring system as it designs the details of the closure system. NRC's role in monitoring should be one of auditing DOE's activities for the purpose of compliance with the performance objectives. While it may be helpful for NRC to review DOE's monitoring program to assist the NRC in developing its program, it is beyond the statute for NRC to require DOE to develop a monitoring plan for NRC review under its consultation role.

Implementing a graded approach to monitoring is reasonable. Reviewing site monitoring reports or other environmental reports is very appropriate and consistent with NRC practice at West Valley and other sites.

Regarding reviewing additional modeling performed by DOE, it is reasonable to expect that DOE will periodically

disposal site. NRC had oversight for both the Hanford and Barnwell disposal sites until that license was withdrawn in 1990's. NRC inspectors and headquarters staff inspected both facilities each year and reviewed the annual monitoring data to assure that the site continued to operate in compliance with the Part 61 performance objectives. The states and NRC can conduct similar monitoring visits as often as necessary to fulfill their obligations under the NDAA.

Annual monitoring reports should be similar in format to regional inspection reports. The topics reviewed (including data) should be listed, dates and results of on-site visits documented and any compliance issues identified for DOE response. NRC procedures for documenting visits (such as regional visits at West Valley), compliance issues and appropriate responses are well established and do not result in an unreasonable burden on DOE. If monitoring of DOE's disposal actions indicates compliance concerns, such reports would provide a reasonable notification to DOE and others and allow time for effective corrective action as needed. Such a graded approach is reasonable and fundamental to NRC's approach to compliance with all of its regulatory activities. Ultimately if compliance issues can not be resolved NRC has an obligation to inform Congress and would do so accordingly. However, DOE would expect to resolve any such issues well before any such report would be needed.

9) Page 10-3 lines 2-5

The purpose of the monitoring plan is to monitor to determine if the Performance Objectives of Part 61 are met. It is not to determine if the requirements in the State plans are met. The purpose of NRC coordination on the development of the plan is, therefore, not to expand the plan to cover the State's needs but to obtain the State's views on whether the monitoring program will obtain the information necessary to monitor compliance with the Performance Objectives. Thus, monitoring should not be modified to satisfy the requirements of the State unless NRC needs that information to carry out its responsibility. This is similar to the issue in the State of Maine for Maine Yankee where the NRC did not agree to the State's demand that it inspect to the State's lower dose standard.

10) Page 10-3 line 30

The State is not necessarily in a position to take action. The phrase "Congress, the State, and DOE" should be changed to "Congress, State to the extent legally authorized, and DOE".

As discussed above monitoring DOE's assumptions and analyses is impractical in an annual monitoring cycle. DOE

can be used to assess previous assumptions and update analyses based on among other things monitoring data that is obtained over a number of years. This approach is consistent with PA updates at existing Part 61 sites such as the Barnwell site near SRS.

Monitoring environmental performance indicators is quite appropriate and is included in current DOE reports. Any data monitoring that is unique to disposal actions and needed, can be added to the annual reporting program on a reasonable schedule. Such monitoring should indicate any early releases and provide opportunity for action before releases occur beyond the buffer zone.

Any concerns with intrusion should be addressed through periodic PA review. Since intrusion performance will not be tested until well beyond 100 year institutional control period, monitoring plans would not be pertinent.

Protection of individuals during operations and off site releases are well covered by various DOE orders consistent with 10 CFR part 20. There is no need for duplication of this effort under a monitoring role. If necessary, such concerns could also be easily covered in annual monitoring reports similar to what was done at West Valley, Hanford and Barnwell.

protocol consistent with other sites like West Valley. Such an approach should lead to a reasonable monitoring program using existing reporting mechanisms which can be supplemented, if necessary, to address any new or unique monitoring issues posed by 3116 waste determinations.