

6/16/06
TIFR 34969
19

From: "Edith" <gbur1@comcast.net>
To: "D. Ashley" <DJA1@nrc.gov>, "Michael Masnik" <MTM2@nrc.gov>, <OysterCreekEIS@nrc.gov>, "Bo Pham" <BMP@nrc.gov>
Date: 09/12/2006 8:09:52 PM
Subject: Re: More Questions regarding the EIS

Thank you . Yes, i do wish more information, as follows:

1. Can you refer me to data and specific information
2. You said that " the amount of radioactive material released to the environment during normal operations is precisely known."

What levels of radionuclides are considered background as opposed to elevated levels ? - Can it be answered in millicuries and rads instead of rem ? This applies to Sr 90, Cs 137 and

OysterCreek has emitted the greatest amount of airborne radioactivity, of any

reactor in the US. The amount is about 77 curies of iodine 131 and iodine and particulates with a half life of 8 days or more.

However you testified that OCNGS radiological emissions

were a tenth of the amount allowed or .026 millirams.

How do the two data compare? What about the conclusions?

Is it possible that short lasting isotopes are not counted? Do you believe that because an isotope decays rapidly it vanishes harmlessly ? Do you know

what short lived isotopes become transformed into different radioactive elements as

they decay?

What does the NRC consider a safe level ? Do you disagree with the National Academy of Sciences June 2005 BEIR VII report that concludes all doses of radiation are harmful?

If it is calculated that 12 deaths would occur among residents or workers from emissions is

it worth the risk?

3. Cs 137 and cobalt 50 were found in estuary near Little Egg Harbor, What were the levels? Were other radionuclides found?"

4. The SEIS (Part 2, 33 said during the 80's "OCNGS ended the operational releases liquid radioactive waste discharges and low level radioactive into Barnegat Bay and Oyster Creek ."

RECEIVED

2006 SEP 14 AM 10:28

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
10/20/06

SONSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-REDS = ADM-03
Add =
m. masnik (MTH2)

Wasn't there concern about the accumulation of 20 years of radioactive discharges to

Barnegat Bay and Oyster Creek.

5. You stated that "concentrations are decreasing over time due to radioactive decay" as a reason for not removing all of the isotopes.

However, Were tests taken for long lived fission products including plutonium 239, (half life of 24,000 years), radium 226 (half life of 1,600 years) uranium 233 (half life 162,000 years, -

6. . You stated that some of the contaminated areas and soil was not removed because The McLaren/Hart report states that radionuclide activity in the soils at the Oyster Creek Plant are not impacting the offsite concentrations are decreasing over time due to radioactive decay - environment.. Where is your proof ?

7. What scientific proof do you have that " Wells with elevated levels of radioactive contamination in the Toms River area have been shown to be the result of naturally occurring radioisotopes." What natural isotopes?

8. Clean Ocean Action testified that there is an increase of contamination in the soils and documented and was ignored., Would it make any difference in your assessment

8. Why does the NRC depend OCNCS for self monitoring when concerned taxpayers

disagree because it is akin to asking the wolf to guard the chicken coop?
The public

and experts have questioned the monitoring and sampling programs and being self serving

and/or unscientific.

Why not involve the National Academy of Sciences in the SEIS when it has

the confidence of the US Congress was requested by elected officials'

----- Original Message -----

From: Edith

To: Bo Pham

Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2006 1:33 AM

Subject: Re: Questions regarding the EIS

To: NRC staff - Thank you . Yes I do want more information.

As follows:

----- Original Message -----

From: Bo Pham

To: gbur1@comcast.net

Cc: D. Ashley ; Michael Masnik ; OysterCreekEIS@nrc.gov

Sent: Friday, September 01, 2006 2:37 PM

Subject: Fwd: Questions regarding the EIS

Dear Ms. Gbur:

I am writing on behalf of Dr. Masnik in reply to your email on 8/30/06. Below, you'll find our responses for each question stated in your email. Please let us know if you would like additional information regarding this matter. Thank you.

Questions regarding the McLaren/Hart 2000 documents on cobalt 60 and Cesium 137 releases in several locations at OCNCS:

1. Why some, not all removed?

The McLaren/Hart report describes the existing conditions of radionuclide concentrations in soil at the site as of February 2000. Soil contamination in limited areas of the site is the result of historical spills or leaks from pipes and tanks containing contaminated water. Depending on the extent, nature, and location of the spills, some of these areas have been excavated and the soil removed. The McLaren/Hart report states that radionuclide activity in the soils at the Oyster Creek Plant are not impacting the offsite environment.

Limited areas of on site soil contamination have been left in place for the following reasons: (1) a very limited extent of radionuclides is actually in the soil, (2) the concentrations are decreasing over time due to radioactive decay, (3) groundwater is not being impacted, and (4) access to the area is controlled and limited. In addition, the McLaren/Hart report notes that in many cases far greater radiation doses would be accumulated by the plant workers if they were to remove the soils, as a consequence of being within proximity to contained radiation sources nearby. This exposure far exceeds the resulting dose that could be avoided by the removal of the soil. Consequently, delaying the cleanup of these areas until the plant is decommissioned has the benefit of reducing overall worker radiation doses, while still not impacting off-site areas.

2. Why wasn't it discovered earlier.

As stated above, the McLaren/Hart report describes the existing conditions of radionuclide concentrations in soil at the site as of February 2000, and was based on existing and well documented information. The report summarizes historical spills, releases, and soil sampling results as far back as 1981 and did not identify previously unknown areas of contamination. In general, soil sampling was conducted soon after spills or releases were identified. Therefore, findings in the McLaren/Hart did not represent any new discoveries; the report merely summarizes known and recorded historical conditions.

3. Will there be a followup study?

See next question.

4. Was there or will there be an NRC investigation of the bioaccumulation of Cs-137 and Cobalt in marine life in Barnegat Bay and Oyster Creek as well as our wells.

As part of preparing the Environmental Impact Statement for OCNCS's license renewal request, the NRC is analyzing and investigating the impact of any potential bioaccumulation of radionuclides in the Barnegat Bay & Oyster Creek. The issuance of the OCNCS draft SEIS documents our preliminary findings on this matter.

All nuclear plants were licensed with the expectation that they would release radioisotopes to both the air and water during normal operation. The releases were, and are, controlled releases so that the amount of radioactive material released to the environment during normal operations is precisely known. The fate of the released materials in the environment is known based on the results of many studies. The movement of these materials through the environment is predicted by models that have gone through extensive field verification.

Additionally, licensees, including Oyster Creek, are required to sample various trophic levels in the environment as a check on the model's predictions. As stated in Section 2.2.7 of the Draft SEIS, AmerGen has conducted a radiological environmental monitoring program (REMP) around the OCNCS site since 1966, with the results presented annually in the OCNCS Annual Radiological Environmental Operating Report. Elevated levels of radioactive contamination above what is expected in marine life in Barnegat Bay and Oyster Creek due to the operation of Oyster Creek have not been found. Furthermore the licensee's program to substantially reduce liquid releases to the discharge in recent years will reduce contamination of aquatic organisms. There is no evidence that indicates that elevated levels of radioactive

The site radiological environmental monitoring program (REMP) includes monitoring of the concentrations of beta and gamma emitters, iodine, and strontium in the air; concentrations of gamma emitters in surface water, well water, fish, clams, sediment, and vegetation; concentrations of tritium in surface and well water; and direct radiation. Sampling locations are chosen based on meteorological factors, preoperational planning, and results of land-use surveys. In order to establish a baseline to distinguish between background and plant releases, a number of locations, in areas very unlikely to be affected by plant operations--such as upwind, up river, and upgradient--are selected as control points. The sampling results for these control locations are considered to be background levels. These levels vary, depending on environmental media as well as radionuclide.

Bo Pham
Environmental Project Manager
Division of License Renewal
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-8450
O-7B1
bmp@nrc.gov

>>> OysterCreekEIS 9/1/06 1:57 PM >>>

>>> "Edith" <gbur1@comcast.net> 8/30/06 3:30 PM >>>

To Donnie Ashley and Dr Masnik,

Your response to help me in preparing comments.

The following questions regards the radiological impacts from OCNGS gaseous and liquid releases harmful to people and marine life.

Part 2 -25-1-7

McLaren/Hart 2000 documents cobalt 60 and Cesium 137 releases in several locations, some of which was excavated,

1. Why some, not all removed? Is it possible?
2. Why wasn't it discovered earlier? (Especially if it was released before 1989)?

Cesium 137 has a half life of 35 years and is harmful to the ovaries. Cobalt 60, a half life of 5 years and is harmful to the liver.

3. Will there be a followup study?

4. Was there or will there be an NRC investigation of the Bioaccumulation of Cs 137 and Cobalt in marine life in Barnegat Bay and Oyster Creek as well as our wells?

4. , 4. In this assessment Radionuclides were documented in groundwater and soil sediments. What is considered background levels?

SEIS Part 2, 33, lines 1-12

OCNGS claims to have stopped releasing radionuclides and low level isotopes and radioactive waste discharges during the 80's.

The DEP found no compliance issues or toxicity.

However, McLaren/Hart 2000 documents Cs 137 and Cobalt 60 releases.'

Edith Gbur, Jersey Shore Nuclear Watch

Mail Envelope Properties (45074C41.BED : 13 : 52205)

Subject: Re: More Questons regarding the EIS
Creation Date 09/12/2006 8:09:05 PM
From: "Edith" <gbur1@comcast.net>

Created By: gbur1@comcast.net

Recipients

nrc.gov
 OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
 DJA1 (D. Ashley)

nrc.gov
 TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
 MTM2 (Michael Masnik)
 OysterCreekEIS

nrc.gov
 TWGWPO03.HQGWDO01
 BMP (Bo Pham)

Post Office

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
 TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
 TWGWPO03.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov
 nrc.gov
 nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	10787	09/12/2006 8:09:05 PM
TEXT.htm	32767	
Mime.822	47778	

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