

Sollenberger, Dennis

FSME

From: Dennis Sollenberger
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2008 9:52 AM
To: Donna Janda
Subject: FW: Q & A 09152008 draft.doc
Attachments: AgreementScheduleNJ.doc; NJAgrmtQ A 09152008 draft.doc; Q & A 09152008 draft.doc

Donna:

The one attachment is the list of questions from Jack Hayes. The second attachment is the list of questions with my first shot at answers for the Agreement State questions. Please review and let's discuss so that you are prepared. I have also attached the latest tentative schedule for the New Jersey agreement application processing.

Dennis Sollenberger

From: John Hayes
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 10:50 AM
To: Allen Fetter; Allen Gross; Andrea Kock; Christianne Ridge; Daniel Gillen; Duane Schmidt; John Bradbury; John Hull; Jon Peckenpaugh; Karen Pinkston; Kenneth Kline; Lifeng Guo; Mark Fuhrmann; Mark Roberts; Michael Clark; Phil Reed; Raymond Lorson; Rebecca Tadesse; Robert Johnson (FSME)
Cc: Shieldalloy NPEmails; Dennis Sollenberger; Donna Janda
Subject: Q & A 09152008 draft.doc

New items are highlighted in blue. Note some new ?'s and answers.

G/22

Potential Processing Schedule for New Jersey

<u>Event</u>	<u># Weeks*</u>	<u>Date**</u>	<u>Date***</u>
			(drop dead)
Part 1-Review of the Request for an Agreement			
Receipt of Draft Request	0	10/3/07	
Team Concludes Completeness Review	3	10/24/07	
Completeness comment letter mailed	3	01/16/08	
Receipt of formal request	8	10/10/08	11/07/08
Team review of formal request finished	8	12/12/08	01/02/08
PM completes Commission Paper, including draft staff assessment and FR notice	2	12/26/08	01/16/09
Part 2-FR publication & public comment period			
NRC Offices concur on Commission Paper	3	01/16/09	02/06/09
EDO sends Paper to Commission	2	01/30/09	02/20/09
Commission approves publication	2	02/13/09	03/06/09
First publication in FR	1	02/20/09	03/13/09
Public comment period ends	4	03/20/09	04/10/09
PM analyzes comments; completes final assessment and Commission paper	4	04/17/09	05/08/09
Part 3-Final processing and Commission approval			
NRC Offices concur on final assessment and paper	3	05/08/09	05/29/09
EDO signs paper	2	05/22/09	06/12/09
Commission SRM approving Agreement	4	06/19/09	07/10/09
Effective date of Agreement	4	07/17/09	08/07/09

* The number of weeks to accomplish each action is taken from SA-700 and each time frame is considered generally as the minimum time to accomplish each of the actions.

** The date presented here is the actual date of past actions and projected earliest dates based on an acceptable complete application submitted by the State of New Jersey no later than October 10, 2008. If the application is submitted after that date, the application needs significant revision, or estimated times are not met, the effective date of the Agreement would be later than that presented here.

*** The drop dead date is a timeline based on the termination date of the waiver for States to retain their authority over 11e.(3) & (4) byproduct materials as defined in the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Agreement State Issues – Lead:Hayes/Sollenberger

What happens to the process if NJ becomes a NRC Agreement State?

If New Jersey becomes an Agreement State, the NRC will turn over the regulatory responsibility to New Jersey on the effective date of the Agreement. All licenses transferred to New Jersey would then be subject to the New Jersey regulations. All NRC regulatory activity on these licenses would cease, except for investigation/enforcement actions for activities conducted while under NRC jurisdiction.

What if the draft EIS has been issued? What if the Safety Evaluation has been issued? What if the final EIS has been issued? What if the hearing is occurring when this happens.

Bases on past presentence, the NRC would move to terminate and proceeding since NRC would no longer have jurisdiction to continue the activity. The State of New Jersey may choose to use the documents developed by NRC but New Jersey is not required to use them.

In the West Chicago site example, NRC had issue a final EIS, SER and license. The licensing action was challenged and was in court at the time that the amendment to the Illinois Agreement went into effect. The State requested termination of the proceedings based on the fact that NRC no longer had jurisdiction and the court agreed.

The State then notified the West Chicago facility that portions of their current license (transferred to the State from NRC) were not in compliance with Illinois regulations. The licensee and the State negotiated new license conditions that eventually brought the license and the facility into compliance with the State requirements. The ultimate disposition of the contamination on the site was different than that originally authorized under the NRC license.

Project Management & Schedule – Lead:Hayes

When is Rev. 1b to the DP scheduled for submittal to the staff?

What is the present schedule for the review of the DP?

What review areas did the DP RAIs cover?

In 2006, the NRC indicated it would complete a review of the DP by 2008. What has caused the delays?

Groundwater Issues – Lead:Peckenpaugh

Is the staff going to require additional groundwater sampling and surface water sampling?

Overall Issues- Lead: All

What changes has SMC made since their DP was submitted in June 2006?

Radiological Dose Assessment

Will SMC be required to include radon in their dose assessment? **Lead: Schmidt**

What is the status of the dose analysis? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston**

What is the dose limit for sites following decommissioning **Lead: Gross & Pinkston** and how does that relate to risk of cancer? **Lead: Schmidt**

How will NRC ensure that SMC meets this dose criteria? **Lead: Schmidt, Gross & Pinkston**

What pathways are included in the SMC dose assessment? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston**

Has the slag or could the slag leach to the groundwater and what would be the impact on the dose to a member of the public? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston**

Will NRC require that SMC evaluate the dose due to leaching to groundwater? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston, Bradbury, Furhmann, & Reed & Peckenpaugh**

From a dose to the public perspective, isn't it safest to remove the pile rather than leave it there? **Lead: Schmidt, Gross & Pinkston**

What is the dose currently to a member of the public living near the site? **Lead: Roberts**

What dose is expected to a member of the public during decommissioning operations? **Lead: Schmidt**

What dose did people receive when Shieldalloy was an operating facility? **Lead: Roberts**

Cost Benefit Analysis

Does the cost benefit analysis include long term costs (land depreciation) due to the slag being present? **Lead: Schmidt**

Engineered Barrier

Will repairs be required to the engineered barrier? **Lead: Gillen** If yes, what types, how frequent **Lead: Gillen** and will their be sufficient money in the trust fund to cover these expenditures? **Lead: Kline**

The engineered barrier must be designed so as not to require maintenance to achieve the 1000 year stability requirement. However, it is likely that Shieldalloy/custodian will implement minor infrequent repairs such as fixing fences, or repairing any inadvertant human intrusion impacts.

How does the cap design influence dose? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston** Is SMC's proposed cap design adequate to protection public health? **Lead: Gillen**

We have just begun our review of the draft engineered barrier design as submitted by Shieldalloy, and will be assessing in detail its infiltration and long-term stability aspects. However, only a design that is acceptably protective of public health and safety and the environment can be approved by the NRC.

How long will the cap last? **Lead: Gillen**

The regulations require a design that will last at least 1000 years.

Environmental Assessment

What review areas did the environment RAIs cover? **Lead: Fetter**

Hearing

When will the hearing take place? **Lead: Clark**

NRC Policy

Why is the period of performance only 1000 years when many of the isotopes on the site have half-lives in the tens of thousands of years? **Lead: All**

What happens if Shieldalloy can't provide a design that meets the dose standards for restricted or unrestricted release? long-term control? **Lead: Tadesse**

Why doesn't the NRC require SMC to remove the slag & baghouse material from the site?
Lead: Tadesse

Slag & Baghouse Dust Leaching

Has SMC provided results on the leachability of the slag and what is NRC's conclusion? **Lead: Bradbury, Furhmann, & Reed**

Has the/could the slag leach to surface water? What is NRC's conclusion? **Lead: Bradbury, Furhmann, & Reed**

What are the requirements for demonstrating that leaving the slag in place is safe? (you have this in several places under the individual sections but you might want a general question and answer that contains the more general information under 20.1402 under your section ,i.e they need to meet the dose limits, they need to have ICs, etc.) **Lead: All**

Health Effects

Is cancer in our area attributable to radiation from SMC? **Lead: Schmidt** Is it attributable to chromium from the site?

Financial Assurance

What happens if Shieldalloy goes bankrupt in the future? **Lead: Kline**

Agreement State Issues – Lead:Hayes/Sollenberger

What happens to the process if NJ becomes a NRC Agreement State? What if the draft EIS has been issued? What if the Safety Evaluation has been issued? What if the final EIS has been issued? What if the hearing is occurring when this happens.

Project Management & Schedule – Lead:Hayes

When is Rev. 1b to the DP scheduled for submittal to the staff?

What is the present schedule for the review of the DP?

What review areas did the DP RAls cover?

In 2006, the NRC indicated it would complete a review of the DP by 2008. What has caused the delays?

Groundwater Issues – Lead:Peckenpaugh

Is the staff going to require additional groundwater sampling and surface water sampling?

Overall Issues- Lead: All

What changes has SMC made since their DP was submitted in June 2006?

Radiological Dose Assessment

Will SMC be required to include radon in their dose assessment? **Lead: Schmidt**

What is the status of the dose analysis? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston**

What is the dose limit for sites following decommissioning **Lead: Gross & Pinkston** and how does that relate to risk of cancer? **Lead: Schmidt**

How will NRC ensure that SMC meets this dose criteria? **Lead: Schmidt, Gross & Pinkston**

What pathways are included in the SMC dose assessment? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston**

Has the slag or could the slag leach to the groundwater and what would be the impact on the dose to a member of the public? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston**

Will NRC require that SMC evaluate the dose due to leaching to groundwater? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston, Bradbury, Furhmann, & Reed & Peckenpaugh**

From a dose to the public perspective, isn't it safest to remove the pile rather than leave it there? **Lead: Schmidt, Gross & Pinkston**

What is the dose currently to a member of the public living near the site? **Lead: Roberts**

What dose is expected to a member of the public during decommissioning operations? **Lead: Schmidt**

What dose did people receive when Shieldalloy was an operating facility? **Lead: Roberts**

Cost Benefit Analysis

Does the cost benefit analysis include long term costs (land depreciation) due to the slag being present? **Lead: Schmidt**

Engineered Barrier

Will repairs be required to the engineered barrier? **Lead: Gillen** If yes, what types, how frequent **Lead: Gillen** and will their be sufficient money in the trust fund to cover these expenditures? **Lead: Kline**

The engineered barrier must be designed so as not to require maintenance to achieve the 1000 year stability requirement. However, it is likely that Shieldalloy/custodian will implement minor infrequent repairs such as fixing fences, or repairing any inadvertant human intrusion impacts.

How does the cap design influence dose? **Lead: Gross & Pinkston** Is SMC's proposed cap design adequate to protection public health? **Lead: Gillen**

We have just begun our review of the draft engineered barrier design as submitted by Shieldalloy, and will be assessing in detail its infiltration and long-term stability aspects. However, only a design that is acceptably protective of public health and safety and the environment can be approved by the NRC.

How long will the cap last? **Lead: Gillen**

The regulations require a design that will last at least 1000 years.

Environmental Assessment

What review areas did the environment RAIs cover? **Lead: Fetter**

Hearing

When will the hearing take place? **Lead: Clark**

NRC Policy

Why is the period of performance only 1000 years when many of the isotopes on the site have half-lives in the tens of thousands of years? **Lead: All**

What happens if Shieldalloy can't provide a design that meets the dose standards for restricted or unrestricted release? long-term control? **Lead: Tadesse**

Why doesn't the NRC require SMC to remove the slag & baghouse material from the site? **Lead: Tadesse**

Slag & Baghouse Dust Leaching

Has SMC provided results on the leachability of the slag and what is NRC's conclusion? **Lead: Bradbury, Furhmann, & Reed**

Has the/could the slag leach to surface water? What is NRC's conclusion? **Lead: Bradbury, Furhmann, & Reed**

What are the requirements for demonstrating that leaving the slag in place is safe? (you have this in several places under the individual sections but you might want a general question and answer that contains the more general information under 20.1402 under your section ,i.e they need to meet the dose limits, they need to have ICs, etc.) **Lead: All**

Health Effects

Is cancer in our area attributable to radiation from SMC? **Lead: Schmidt** Is it attributable to chromium from the site?

Financial Assurance

What happens if Shieldalloy goes bankrupt in the future? **Lead: Kline**
