



Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

Rachel Carson State Office Building

P.O. Box 8469

Harrisburg, PA 17105-8469

January 16, 2004

Bureau of Radiation Protection

717-787-3720
Fax: 717-783-8965

Ms. Elaine Brummett
c/o NRC Document Control Desk
Mail Stop T8-A33
11545 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

Subject: Revised Draft Environmental Assessment For The Cabot License Renewal (L52514)

Docket: 40-6940

Dear Ms. Brummett:

This letter is provided in response to the request for comments on the Revised Draft Environmental Assessment for the Cabot License Renewal, SMB-920.

Section 3.0 The Proposed Action

In section 3.0 of the revised draft EA, the following statement is used to summarize the proposed action. "The license activities will not change in the renewed license, except for some modifications to the environmental monitoring program." However, in *Section 3.1 Description of Current Operation* that follows, it is recognized that "CSM plans to upgrade its current wastewater treatment system. The changes to the system were approved by the NRC August 27, 2002." These two statements are inconsistent. Any proposed change to the wastewater treatment system should be mentioned as a changed activity in section 3.0 also.

In addition, section 5.6 for hydrology surface water recognizes DEP NPDES Permit No. 0011266 and section 5.8 for air and water quality recognizes a DEP CAAA Title V emissions permit and permit for treatment of acid wastewater and hazardous waste. The draft EA mentions DEP regulation of HF emissions, MIBK and residual waste, but section 3.0 and the discussions in the sections that follow, do not provide information on the extent of the impact from the proposed action on water construction permits and air and waste permits from DEP.

Section 6.7 Radiological Dose and Safety – Potential Radiation Doses. In the first paragraph, potential impacts from releases are discussed. Doses are estimated from monitoring results and characterized as "within regulatory limits." This does not establish a good reference point for the reader. Numerical doses, ranges or percentages of the regulatory limits should be specified. In paragraph two a maximum dose of a few millirem is referenced for disposal of wastewater filtercake sludge containing the maximum anticipated concentration of radionuclides. However, it is not clear to the reader whether radium and radon decay products are also part of the calculations for the referenced landfill/resident farmer scenario. In fact, nowhere in the discussion of sludge in the document is information on radium and radon concentrations or assumptions about them provided.

nmss01



Section 7.1 Effluent Monitoring

If releases of solid residue from liquid waste treatment have historically been well below 10 pCi/g as referenced here and in section 3.1, setting the release limit at 10 pCi/g is unnecessarily high and not prudent. Though the reference in section 6.7 above states "no impact is expected to result from release of this sludge", radiation detectors at the disposal landfill are likely to alarm when the release limit approaches 10 pCi/g. Detectors are in place at Pennsylvania landfills under 25 Pa. Code 273.201(l) and 288.201(g) to prevent disposal of licensed radioactive material and low level radioactive waste, as well as TENORM and radioactive consumer products that may pose a risk to health. The Environmental Assessment acknowledges the Air and Water Quality programs of Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Protection, but again does not address the potential impact to the department's municipal and residual waste programs. If material from this licensee trips a landfill portal monitor alarm (about 10 microR/h above background), a detailed dose analysis of the waste in the landfill would be needed to be performed to demonstrate whether the waste meets Department criteria to be cleared for burial.

Section 9.0 Consultations

It is stated that CSM proposed changes to the monitoring program (July 15, 2003) that include replacing measurement of gross alpha and beta with specific analysis for uranium and radium (Ra-226 and Ra-228) and the staff (NRC) determined that these changes are justified. The Department considers this detailed analysis to be mandatory for issuance of the license and recommends that it include thorium-232 as well as thorium 230 if Th-230 equilibrium cannot be assured. It is also unclear whether this expanded detailed analysis was meant to apply only to effluent monitoring or whether it refers to wastewater filtercake sludge as well. The Department considers the same detailed analysis of solid waste being offered for burial to be a mandatory requirement for license renewal.

Table 9.1 Consultations

Note: Under Jeff Whitehead, Purpose of Consultation column there is no program "Operation Radiation Protection". Mr. Whitehead is under Robert Maiers in the Decommissioning Section. Ivna Shanbaky's position is Radiation Protection "Manager" not "Director". Under Agency it should be listed that the Bureau of Radiation Protection is part of the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Francine Carlini, Jennifer Fields are and Ivna Shanbaky (retired) was with the PA DEP Southeast Regional Office (SERO).

This comment summary has been reviewed in consultation with the DEP Southeast Regional Office which regulates environmental permits for the referenced facility. Any questions regarding these comments should be directed to Louis Ray Urciuolo at the address above. The comments or lack thereof made herein do not imply agreement with actions of the NRC or obligate the DEP to take any specific action with regard to the DEP permitted activities discussed in the draft EA.

With the exception of these items there is no objection to presentation of the material in the revised draft environmental assessment.

Sincerely,



David J. Allard, CHP
Director