



OVERVIEW OF NUREG-1307, Revision 14, “REPORT ON WASTE BURIAL CHARGES”

March 2, 2011

Clayton Pittiglio - NRC

Steve Short- PNNL

NUREG-1307, Revision 14 (2010):

- Advised licensees when new disposal facilities become available, disposal rates will likely be significantly higher.
- Information received since the waste vendor option was introduced in 1998 suggests that the percentage of waste that is actually processed by a waste vendor may be less than 100 percent.
- NRC is considering adjusting the waste vendor option to reflect this additional information in the next revision of NUREG-1307, which could result in an increase in the cost estimate for the waste vendor option.

Key Assumptions/Points:

- Low level Waste (LLW) generated during operations is disposed of using operating funds;
- Plants that have no disposal site available are forced to provide interim storage for this waste; volumes may become significant;
- If additional disposal sites do not become available prior to shutdown, LLW generated during plant operations will be disposed of during decommissioning;

Key Assumptions/Points (Continued):

- Disposal cost for stored waste not accounted for in minimum amount under 10 CFR 50.75(c) (nor would cost of D&D of the storage facility);
- For plants that have no disposal site available, the cost for disposal is the same as that provided for the Atlantic Compact, for lack of a better alternative at this time; and
- NUREG-1307, Rev 8 (1998), applied the assumption of 100/0 Vendor/Direct Disposal option.

NUREG-1307, Revision 15, Proposed Changes:

- Vendor/Direct Disposal ratio of 70/30:
 - Current ratio 100/0 has an approximate \$350 million delta
 - Review of licensee's submitted site specific cost estimate and actual decommissioning experience (more than 30 cases – ML110390111) support 70/30 ratio
 - Potential cost impact range from \$50 – \$70 million
- Aligns formula amount with site specific cost estimates/assumptions, including possible impacts from life extension;

NUREG-1307, Revision 15, Proposed Changes (Continued):

- Update Disposal Costs based on new disposal facility costs; and
- When new disposal facilities become available, disposal rates will likely be significantly higher.

Example: SONGS Unit 1

- SONGS submittal March 31, 2009
 - Formula amount \$344.1 million
 - Site specific estimate \$394.0 million
 - Actual radiological expenditure \$385.2 million
 - Balance to complete decommissioning \$8.8 million
- SONGS submittal March 31, 2010
 - Formula amount \$337.3 million
 - Site specific estimate \$490.4 million
 - Actual radiological expenditure \$461.8 million
 - Balance to complete decommissioning \$28.6 million

SONGS Unit 1

RESULTS:

- Despite expected completion cost of \$8.8 million, SONGS spent \$76.6 million since their March 31, 2009 report, and needs an additional \$28.6 million to complete decommissioning;
- The increase in decommissioning costs of \$86.4 million from 2009 to 2010 is mostly due to LLW disposal cost; and
- Actual decommissioning costs exceed the formula by \$153 million (45%)

FORMULA - 10 CFR 50.75(c):

Estimated Cost (Year X) = [1986 \$ Cost] [A L_x + B E_x + C B_x]

A, B, and C are the fractions of the total dollar costs that are attributable to labor (0.65), energy (0.13), and burial (0.22), respectively, and sum to 1.0. The factors L_x, E_x, and B_x are defined by:

L_x = labor cost adjustment,

E_x = energy cost adjustment,

B_x = LLW burial/disposition cost adjustment^[1]

QUESTIONS?



Contact: Clayton Pittiglio
Phone: 301-415-1435
E-mail: Clayton.Pittiglio@NRC.gov

Contact: Steve Short
Phone: 509-375-2868
E-mail: Steve.Short@pnl.gov