

11/9/01

**From:** Mark Oncavage <oncavage@bellsouth.net>  
**To:** <dgeis@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 12/31/01 7:45PM  
**Subject:** Decommissioning Comments

66 FR 65721

14

Dear Sir:

I am submitting the following comments to draft Supplement 1, NUREG-0586, Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning Nuclear Facilities.

Sincerely, Mark P. Oncavage

RECEIVED  
NOV 27 7 21 03  
NRC  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20540

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
Cell = M. Morsnik (MTM2)

# **Comments on NUREG-0586**

## **Draft Supplement 1**

by Mark P. Oncavage

1. The evaluation of each nuclear plant site for radioactive contamination can only be done on a site-specific basis. Data of site contamination from Shoreham with zero years of operating experience cannot be compared with 33 years of operation at Big Rock Point and either of those sites can not be compared with a potential 120 years of Calvert Cliff operation or a potential 180 years of Oconee operation. Stating that, generically, all impacts of radioactive contamination from all sites are similar (P. 4-28), is simply wrong. The important concept underlying the Environmental Impact Statement for decommissioning nuclear plants is the health and safety of the public. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff (NRC) is writing an EIS based on an unsupported assumption. The impacts of a nuclear plant site contaminated with radioactivity can be SMALL or MODERATE or LARGE, but the impacts are site-specific and are not similar nor generic.

2. The evaluation of each nuclear plant plant site for radioactive contamination can only be done on a site-specific basis. The liquid low-level radioactive waste dump for St. Lucie 1 and 2 is the Atlantic Ocean, whereas the dump for liquid low-level radioactive wastes at Turkey Point 3 and 4 is a closed cooling canal system. The northern end of the canal system, Lake Warren, is the designated dump. If the sediments of Lake Warren and the cooling canals contain levels of radioactivity above those levels that are deemed safe for unrestricted human activity, then Lake Warren is one of the "safety-related structures, systems, and components" that needs to be decontaminated and dismantled. Lake Warren and the canals are also safety related as they function to mitigate the effects of a design basis accident by collecting and concentrating radioactive spills, dumped liquids, leachates, and site runoff. Other nuclear plants that dump their liquid radioactive wastes into closed waters will also require site-specific evaluations.

3. The evaluation of each nuclear plant site for radioactive contamination can only be done on a site-specific basis. In NUREG-0743, page 4-11, Turkey Point units 3 and 4 averaged 340 curies of radioactive solid waste per year. Twenty two years later NUREG-1437, Supplement 5, page 2-12 states that in 1999, units 3 and 4 shipped solid waste containing 834.3 curies per year, an increase of 145 %, yet Turkey Point is only 47 % through its potential operational life. Projections concerning the amounts of radioactivity in solid waste, gaseous waste, liquid waste, and site contamination appear to be pure guesswork with a potential operational life of 60 years per unit. For the NRC Staff to conclude that site contamination for all nuclear plant sites is generically similar and that the impacts to the human environment are SMALL, has no basis in fact. The NRC Staff needs to present the reasoning behind its projections to the scientific community for scientific scrutiny.

4. Rubblization (p. 4-14), the breaking of contaminated concrete structures into gravels and blocks cannot be considered an option where:

- A. the leachate plume could contaminate potable water,
- B. the leachate plume could contaminate water used for food production such as  
farming, fishing, seafood harvest, or dairy,
- C. the leachate plume could contaminate closed bodies of water such as cooling  
canals or cooling ponds, and
- D. airborne particles could contaminate food crops, fishing waters, seafood  
harvesting waters, or dairy areas.

All contaminated building materials must be removed from the nuclear plant site.

5. The Generic Environmental Impact Statement needs to specify inappropriate uses of decommissioning funds.

- A. Using funds for temporary procedures, such as SAFSTOR, is inappropriate.
- B. Using funds for the maintenance and monitoring of temporary procedures, such as SAFSTOR, is inappropriate.
- C. Transferring funds from PSC/PUC control to licensee control is inappropriate.
- D. Using funds for the temporary storage of spent fuel, such as ISFSI or PFS, is inappropriate.
- E. Using funds for the settlement of bankruptcy claims is inappropriate.
- F. Using funds as collateral is inappropriate.
- G. All other uses of funds that do not directly result in the permanent cleanup of contaminated nuclear plant sites, is inappropriate.

Since the funds were obtained as an extra fee from ratepayers for the purpose of safely decommissioning nuclear plants, all of the funds need to be used for that purpose.

6. The massive destruction of September 11th accomplished by the Al Qaeda terrorists has rendered the Waste Confidence Policy ineffective and obsolete. No reasonable person can be assured that high-level nuclear waste can be safely stored at plant sites under present conditions. The GEIS fails to consider the consequences of acts of terrorism and acts of war perpetrated by suicidal zealots against spent fuel facilities at decommissioned nuclear plant sites. This failure of the GEIS needs to be remedied.

7. The GEIS needs to create a chronological list of all the decommissioning activities that accept public participation. All public participation opportunities such as meetings, hearings, oral comments, written comments, petitions, and

interventions need to be listed. At later times when specific dates are known, this list needs to be advertised locally in the affected area. The licensee should also solicit public input on the formulation of decommissioning plans well before the decisions are made.

Submitted  
December 31, 2001

**From:** DGEIS  
**To:** Becky Harty; DaM2; Eva Hickey  
**Date:** 1/7/02 7:40AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Decommissioning Comments

Comments from Mark Oncavage.