NRC STAFF EXHIBIT 16

NUREG-1790, Vol. 1

Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed National Enrichment Facility in Lea County, New Mexico

Chapters 1 through 10 and Appendices A through G

Final Report

Manuscript Completed: June 2005
Date Published: June 2005

Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

13178

surrounding area. The results would be analyzed to show that they were below allowable residual radioactivity limits; otherwise, further decontamination would be performed.

2.1.9 DUF_6 Disposition Options

> ***Waste Classification of Depleted Uranium***
>
> *Depleted uranium is different from most low-level radioactive waste in that it consists mostly of long-lived isotopes of uranium, with small quantities of thorium-234 and protactinium-234. Additionally, in accordance with 10 CFR Parts 40 and 61, depleted uranium is a source material and, if treated as a waste, it would fall under the definition of a low-level radioactive waste per 10 CFR § 61.55(a). The Commission reaffirmed this waste classification in the CLI-05-05 Memorandum and Order dated January 18, 2005. This means that it could be disposed of in a licensed low-level radioactive waste facility if it is in a suitably stable form and meets the performance requirements of 10 CFR Part 61. Therefore, under 10 CFR § 61.55(a), depleted uranium is a low-level radioactive waste.*
>
> *Sources: NRC, 1991; NRC, 2005.*

At full production, the proposed NEF would generate 7,800 metric tons per year (8,600 tons per year) of DUF_6. Initially, the DUF_6 would be stored in Type 48Y cylinders (UBC) on the UBC Storage Pad (LES, 2005a). Each Type 48Y cylinder would hold approximately 12.5 metric tons (13.8 tons), which means that the site, at full production, would generate approximately 627 cylinders of DUF_6 every year. During the operation of the facility, the plant could generate and store up to 15,727 cylinders of DUF_6. LES would own the DUF_6 and maintain the UBC's while they are in storage. Maintenance activities would include periodic inspections for corrosion, valve leakage, or distortion of the cylinder shape, and touch-up painting as required. Problem cylinders would be removed from storage and the material transferred to another storage cylinder. The proposed storage area would be kept neat and free of debris, and all stormwater or other runoff would be routed to the UBC Storage Pad Stormwater Retention Basin for monitoring and evaporation.

Classification of DUF_6

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has evaluated a number of alternative and potential beneficial uses for DUF_6 (DOE, 1999b; Brown et al, 1997). However, the current DUF_6 consumption rate is low compared to the existing DUF_6 inventory (DOE, 1999b), and the potential for a significant commercial market for the DUF_6 to be generated by the proposed NEF is considered to be low. The NRC has assumed that the excess DOE and commercial inventory of DUF_6 would be disposed of as waste (NRC, 1995).

In Memorandum and Order CLI-05-05, the Commission concluded that depleted uranium is appropriately categorized as a low-level radioactive waste (NRC, 2005). Therefore, for the purpose of this EIS, the DUF_6 generated by the proposed NEF will be treated as a Class A low-level waste.

All DUF_6 would be removed from the proposed NEF for disposition outside the State of New Mexico before decommissioning is completed (LES, 2005a). This EIS evaluates in detail two DUF_6 disposition options. These options are described in the following subsections, and Chapter 4 discusses their potential environmental impacts. Section 2.2 discusses additional DUF_6 disposition options but, for the reasons discussed in that section, these options are not evaluated in detail.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board has reported that long-term storage of DUF_6 in the UF_6 form represents a potential chemical hazard if not properly managed (DNFSB, 1995). For this reason, alternatives for the strategic management of depleted uranium include the conversion of DUF_6 stock to a more stable uranium oxide (e.g., triuranium octaoxide [U_3O_8]) form for long-term management (OECD, 2001). DOE also evaluated multiple disposition options for DUF_6 and agreed that conversion to U_3O_8 was preferable for long-term storage and disposal of the depleted uranium due to its chemical stability (DOE, 2000a). Therefore, all the options evaluated in the EIS include conversion of the DUF_6 to U_3O_8.

Two options are proposed for disposition of DUF_6. The first option would be to ship the material to a private conversion facility prior to disposal (Option 1). An alternative available under the provisions of the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) Privatization Act of 1996 would be to ship the material to a DOE conversion facility, either at Portsmouth, Ohio, or at Paducah, Kentucky, for temporary storage and eventual processing by the DOE conversion facility prior to disposal by DOE (Option 2). DOE has issued two final EISs to construct and operate conversion facilities at Paducah, Kentucky, and Portsmouth, Ohio (DOE, 2004a; DOE, 2004b). Additionally, DOE has issued two Records of Decision and construction of the conversion facilities began in July 2004 (DOE, 2004c; DOE, 2004d). Figure 2-12 shows the disposal flow paths for DUF_6 evaluated in this EIS.

What is Class A Low-level Radioactive Waste?

Low-level radioactive waste is defined by what it is not; that is, material classified as low-level radioactive waste does not meet the criteria of high-level radioactive waste, transuranic waste, or mill tailings. Low-level radioactive waste represents about 90 percent of all radioactive wastes, by volume. It includes ordinary items such as cloth, bottles, plastic, wipes, etc. that become contaminated with some radioactive material. These wastes can be generated anywhere radioisotopes are produced or used -- in nuclear power stations, local hospitals, university research laboratories, etc.

For regulatory purposes, there are three classes of low-level radioactive wastes. The NRC classifies low-level radioactive waste as Class A, Class B, or Class C based on the concentration of certain long-lived radionuclides as shown in Tables 1 and 2 of 10 CFR § 61.55 and the physical form and stability requirements set forth in 10 CFR § 61.56. Waste that contains the smallest concentration of the identified radionuclides and meets the stability requirement is considered Class A waste and could be considered for near-surface disposal. Classes B and C wastes contain greater concentrations of radionuclides with longer half-lives, and have stricter disposal requirements than Class A.

Sources: 10 CFR § 61.55 and 61.56.

In this EIS, it is assumed that the proposed private conversion facility would be using the same technology adapted for use by DOE in its conversion facilities. This technology would apply a continuous dry-conversion process based on the commercial process used by Framatome Advanced Nuclear Power, Inc., fuel fabrication facility in Richland, Washington (DOE, 2004a; DOE, 2004b; LES, 2005a).